SEEING FALSE AS FALSE

The Art of Inward Observation

Dr Venkata Rao Potluru

Introduction

Before you go further, understand one thing utterly:
Your life, as it is, is built on deception.
Not the deception of society, not the deception of religion, not the deception of politicians—
but the deception you have created, you have nourished, you have protected.

You are living inside an illusion created by your own thought, and you do not want to come out of it.
You want comfort, not truth.
You want continuity, not clarity.
You want psychological security, not freedom.
And whatever the mind wants becomes the seed of illusion.

Your beliefs are illusions.
Your ideals are illusions.
Your spiritual pursuits are illusions.
Your wounded pride is illusion.
Your hope for a better tomorrow is illusion.
Your idea of "yourself" is the greatest illusion of all.

You have never looked at anything directly.
You look through your opinions, your fears, your experiences,
your conclusions—
a thick wall of mental residue that stands between you and Truth.
You think you see, but you see only what thought conditioned you to see.
You think you understand, but you understand only what fits your conditioning.
You think you feel, but your feelings are reactions of memory.

You are imprisoned, and you call it living.

The world you live in—the world of comparison, ambition, hurt, loneliness,
success, failure—is not life.
It is the echo of past memories playing endlessly inside your skull.

Understand this with absolute, brutal clarity:
There is no freedom as long as the self exists.
And the self exists only through illusion.

This book is not here to comfort you, to guide you,
or to give you new beliefs.
It is not here to help you "improve" your life—
that too is an illusion.
It is here for only one thing:
to tear the veil of illusion you have woven around yourself.

Not slowly.
Not gently.
Not tomorrow.
Now.

To look at fear without running.
To look at pleasure without chasing.
To look at hurt without holding.
To look at yourself without distortion.
This demands a mind that is ruthless toward its own escapes, merciless toward its own deceptions, utterly honest with itself—
a mind that refuses to hide behind prayer, behind meditation, behind philosophy, behind gurus, behind tradition.

If you cannot look with such nakedness, close the book.
Nothing will happen.
You will go on living as you always have—
half asleep, half alive, carrying the dead weight of your past.

But if you can look—truly look—

with no authority, no method, no belief, no hope, no motive—
then in that looking, illusion shatters.
And when illusion shatters, something extraordinary takes place:
a freedom that is not your freedom,
a silence that thought cannot touch,
an intelligence that is not yours or mine,
a clarity without centre,
a love not born of memory.

To help the reader see this movement of the mind more clearly,
In this book, the material is revisited in different ways to invite a deeper perception of Truth, even at the cost of repetition and length.
All point to the same thing:
the art of inward observation,
the art of seeing illusions as illusions,
and discovering freedom in that very seeing.

If you dare to take one step into this fire, let us begin.

Dr. Venkata Rao Potluru
Consultant Surgeon and Author of 'The Timeless Awareness'

Contents

Introduction..... 2

When Illusion Ends 9

The Mind That Does Not Accumulate. 30

Thought, Matter and the silence beyond 42

The Ground That Thought Cannot Enter..... 54

One is so frightened to strip oneself of everything. 56

When the immeasurable is not named..... 63

In the Silence of Not Knowing..... 66

The false Sustains Violence 69

When the False Operates, Truth is Not: 80

The Illusion of Success 89

Truth is Never in Time 97

No God will save Us..... 106

Is the Problem the Fact or the Mind?..... 108

Beyond Goals..... 111

Only seeing 114

When Respectability Ends, Morality Begins..... 119

Facts break conditioning..... 126

Is there an action that is not limited?..... 135

A Place of No Registration 144

What is it that is becoming?..... 154

Is it possible not to record pleasure?..... 164

Don't let thought seep in. 175
Attention in which there is no division 186
How do you observe? 197
Observation without the past 219
Observation means complete attention 232
The analysis is a fragment. 246
Can you listen without accumulation? 260
To Live Without Conflict 273
A Battle Between Two Images 288
Observing Consciousness 302
To discard the false is intelligence 318
See Without 'Me' 333
Thought Is Ever Limited 348
"Goodness Is Unrelated to Evil" 363
Silence of Emptiness 378
What Does It Mean to Be Aware? 393
To Question Everything 410
Living Without Illusion 422
Is Living Thinking? 425
Can Life Be Lived Without Thought? 428
To watch every movement of thought 430
Action without will 438
On Attention 445
The Mind Addicted to Thought 450

Seeing the Falsity of Thought 453
Is prayer a corruption? 456
Can the future be known? 464
Seeing is Acting 477
Reality, Actuality and Truth 485
On seeing a fact 496
Observing Disappointment 500
When There Is No Comparison 504
The illusion of control 506
What Do I Do When I Am Confused? 510
Pleasure vs. Joy 525
Is It Possible to Look with All Your Senses Together? 542
You Must Be Free to Look 556
Die Every Day 573
Me First, You Second 590
The End of Conflict — The Real Revolution 607
Freedom from Fear — The Real Revolution 624
The fear of Survival 642
Learning Is to Act 646
Observing Ourselves 664
The Tremendous Danger of Psychological Registration 681
Why Do You Hesitate? 699
Giving complete attention 715

Are You Free? 734
Escaping From Problems 752
What Will Save Man? 769
Life and Death Go Together 778
A Mind Free to Look 797
Begin to Learn Yourself 816
The Self Always Distorts 834
Be Just with the Living 852
Justice in the World of Illusion 854
Attachment and flowering of goodness 859
To Raise or To Free 866
Can violence heal society? 868
There Is No Distraction 870
Seeking Pleasure 888
Relationship Based on Thought 905
What Shall I Do with Fear? 921
Ending Prejudice 939
If You Have an Image, You Are Going to Be Hurt 947
We Crave to Be Free but Get Trapped 965
Observing Inwardly 982
Order and Compassion 999

When Illusion Ends

To see the false as false is the beginning of intelligence.
Not to correct it, not to replace it with another idea, not to struggle against it—but simply to see it.

Most human beings do not see the false as false.
They see the false as convenient, as comforting, as necessary.
They live in illusion not because they are ignorant, but because illusion offers psychological safety.

The mind is frightened of truth—not of abstract truth, but of the truth that dissolves the centre it has built.
Therefore, it invents beliefs, ideals, explanations, authorities.
These become walls behind which the mind hides.

The false is not something outside of us.
It is not merely political propaganda, religious dogma, or social conditioning—though these are its outer expressions.
The false begins inwardly, with the image one has of oneself.

The moment you say, "I am this," or "I should be that," illusion has begun.

The image is the false.

One may be highly educated, deeply religious, morally upright, socially respected—yet live entirely within illusion.
Because respectability itself is often the refined form of falsehood.

The mind calls something true because it has repeated it for centuries.

It calls something sacred because it has invested emotion in it.
It calls something real because it fears living without it.

But repetition does not make truth.
Belief does not make truth.
Comfort does not make truth.

Truth does not depend on time.

The false thrives in time—in becoming, in gradual improvement, in tomorrow.
The true is immediate or it is not at all.

Therefore, to see the false as false must happen now, or it will never happen.

Most people want to see the false as false gradually.
They want to let go slowly, safely, with guarantees.
But illusion does not end gradually.

You do not slowly see a snake as dangerous.
The moment you see it as a snake, the reaction is immediate.
There is no practice in that seeing.

Similarly, when you see that ambition is destructive, it ends.
When you see that comparison is poison, it ends.
When you see that seeking psychological security is the root of fear, it ends.

If it does not end, you have not seen it.

The difficulty is that we look at the false through thought.
Thought itself is the maker of illusion.
Thought says, “Let me analyse falsehood,”

“Let me overcome illusion,”
“Let me replace this belief with a better one.”

But all these are movements of the same mind that created the false.

Thought cannot free itself from illusion.
It can only move from one illusion to another—more subtle, more respectable, more refined.

So, the question is not, how do I get rid of illusion?
The question is, Can I see without thought interfering?

To see the false as false requires a quality of attention in which there is no observer standing apart.
The observer is the false.

As long as there is an observer trying to correct, judge, or transform, illusion continues.

The observer says, “I must get rid of fear.”
But the observer is fear.

The observer says, “I must be free of greed.”
But the observer is greed.

When this is seen—not verbally, not intellectually, but actually—the division ends.
And with the ending of division, the false has no ground to stand on.

Then the false collapses by itself.

Seeing is not an effort.
Effort implies resistance.

Resistance implies conflict.
Conflict sustains illusion.

Seeing is effortless because it is total.

When you see something totally, there is no second movement.

You do not say, “I see and now I must act.”
The seeing is the action.

This is why discipline is irrelevant.
Practice is irrelevant.
Methods are irrelevant.

All methods promise future freedom.
And freedom postponed is freedom denied.

Truth does not come through systems.
Systems breed followers, not intelligence.

Intelligence comes when the mind is utterly still—not through control, but through understanding.

When the mind sees the falseness of its own movement—its escape, its craving for continuity, its demand for security—it naturally becomes quiet.

That quietness is not emptiness in the sense of lack.
It is emptiness of illusion.

In that emptiness there is clarity.
In that clarity there is compassion.
Not compassion as sentiment, but compassion as the absence of the self.

The self is the greatest falsehood.
The idea that there is a permanent centre, a “me” that must survive psychologically, is the root of all illusion.

When the self ends, the false ends.

And the ending of the false is not something you achieve.
It happens when you no longer protect illusion.

Seeing false as false is not pessimism.
It is the highest form of optimism—because it does not depend on hope.

Hope is another form of illusion.

To live without illusion is to live without fear.
And to live without fear is to live with intelligence.

Such a mind does not belong to any nation, any religion, any ideology.
It belongs to life.

And that mind is never confused—because it does not carry the false.

***

A Dialogue

Questioner:

You often say that truth begins when one sees the false as false. But what does it really mean to see the false? Is it an intellectual recognition?

Teacher:

If it were merely intellectual, it would have very little value. The intellect can recognise countless things and yet continue living as before. Seeing, in the sense we are using the word, is not recognition by thought. It is direct perception.

Questioner:
Direct perception of what?

Teacher:
Of the movement of illusion within oneself. Not as an idea, not as a conclusion, but as a living fact.

Questioner:
Are you saying that most of us live in illusion?

Teacher:
Not most—almost all. And we accept it as normal because it is shared by everyone. An illusion repeated by millions becomes respectable; it becomes tradition, belief, culture. But repetition does not make it true.

Questioner:
What is the nature of this illusion?

Teacher:
The illusion begins with the idea of a permanent psychological centre— "me," "mine," "my experience," "my belief," "my future." From this centre arises fear, desire, ambition, comparison, and conflict.

Questioner:
But surely there must be a self to function in the world?

Teacher:
Functioning does not require a psychological self. The body functions, the brain functions, memory functions. But the "me" as an image seeking continuity is not necessary for living. It is necessary only for psychological security.

Questioner:
Are you saying that the self itself is false?

Teacher:
See it carefully. Is the self anything more than a bundle of memories, experiences, identifications, and fears? Is there a self apart from these? Or is the self the very content of consciousness?

Questioner:
When you put it that way, it seems the self is made of content.

Teacher:
Exactly. And that content is conditioned, limited, fragmentary. Yet the mind clings to it as though it were permanent, sacred, and real. That clinging is illusion.

Questioner:
But how does one see this illusion as false? I understand it verbally, but it does not seem to change anything.

Teacher:
Verbal understanding is not seeing. Seeing happens only when there is attention—complete attention without escape. When you observe the movement of the self without trying to modify it, justify it, or condemn it.

Questioner:
Isn't observation itself an effort?

Teacher:
Effort implies resistance. Where there is resistance, there is conflict. Observation we are speaking of is effortless because it has no motive. You are not observing in order to become something.

Questioner:

But when I observe myself, I often want to change what I see.

Teacher:
That desire to change is the continuation of the self. It is the false trying to correct itself. When you see that very movement as false, the desire to change ends.

Questioner:
So, the observer trying to change is also false?

Teacher:
The observer is the false. There is no separation between the observer and what is observed. When this division ends, observation becomes complete.

Questioner:
What happens when one sees the false completely?

Teacher:
The false ends. Not gradually, not tomorrow, but instantly. Because illusion cannot survive in the light of total perception.

Questioner:
Isn't this too radical? Human beings seem deeply rooted in their illusions.

Teacher:
Radical means going to the root. And the root is illusion. As long as we treat illusion gently, respectfully, or patiently, it continues. But when you see danger as danger, you do not negotiate with it.

Questioner:
Can you give an example?

Teacher:

When you see that comparison breeds envy and sorrow, does comparison continue? Or does it end immediately? If it continues, you have not really seen it.

Questioner:
Then seeing is action.

Teacher:
Seeing is the only action that is not fragmentary. All other action is born of thought and therefore limited.

Questioner:
What about discipline, practice, and spiritual methods?

Teacher:
They are all based on time—on becoming something later. But truth is not a result of time. Practice strengthens the practitioner. Discipline strengthens the controller. Both strengthen the self.

Questioner:
Then what place does thought have?

Teacher:
Thought has its rightful place in practical matters—technology, communication, memory. But when thought tries to understand life, relationship, love, or truth, it creates illusion.

Questioner:
So thought itself is part of the false?

Teacher:
Psychologically, yes. Thought is limited by its very nature. Whatever it touches, it turns into something limited.

Questioner:
When thought becomes quiet, what remains?

Teacher:
Do not ask what remains—that is another form of seeking. See why thought becomes quiet. It becomes quiet when it sees its own limitation. In that seeing, there is silence.

Questioner:
Is that silence something extraordinary?

Teacher:
Do not make it extraordinary. The moment you do, you turn it into an experience to be sought. Silence is simply the absence of noise created by illusion.

Questioner:
In that silence, is there truth?

Teacher:
Truth is not something contained in silence. Silence is the space in which truth can be. But truth is not yours to possess.

Questioner:
What then is the significance of seeing false as false?

Teacher:
It is the ending of conflict. It is the ending of fear. It is the ending of the self as a centre. And in that ending, there is compassion—not cultivated, but natural.

Questioner:
Does such a way of living affect relationship and society?

Teacher:
Profoundly. A mind free of illusion does not divide. It does not belong to a nation, a belief, or an image. Such a mind acts out of intelligence, not ideology.

Questioner:

Is this possible for ordinary human beings?

Teacher:
If you divide human beings into ordinary and extraordinary, you have already created illusion. Truth is for anyone who is willing to look without escape.

Questioner:
So, the real question is whether one is willing to see.

Teacher:
Yes. To see without choice. To see without motive. To see without fear.

That seeing is the flame in which the false burns.

And when the false is gone, what remains is not something you can name.

But it is real.

***

Questioner:
When I look at the night sky, at the vastness of stars and galaxies, my personal problems seem insignificant. Yet when I return to daily life, fear, ambition, and conflict return. Why does this happen?

Teacher:
Because the mind looks at the universe as an object, not as itself. It admires the vastness, but inwardly it remains enclosed within its own small centre.

Questioner:
Are you saying the universe and my inner life are not separate?

Teacher:
The division is created by thought. Thought divides the observer from the observed, the inner from the outer, the human from the cosmic. But division is illusion.

Questioner:
Yet clearly the stars are out there, and I am here.

Teacher:
Physically, yes. Psychologically, no. The same energy that moves the stars moves your thoughts, your fears, your desires. Only, in you, that energy has become distorted through memory and identification.

Questioner:
Is that distortion what you call the false?

Teacher:
Yes. The false is the fragmentation of a single movement into a centre that says, “I am separate.” From that centre arise fear, ambition, and conflict.

Questioner:
But the universe seems to function without conflict. Stars do not compete.

Teacher:
Because the universe does not have a psychological centre seeking security. Only the human mind has created such a centre.

Questioner:
Then is the self a cosmic accident?

Teacher:
The self is not an accident; it is a by-product of memory. Memory is necessary for survival, but when memory becomes identity, illusion begins.

Questioner:
Is that why humanity feels so isolated in a vast universe?

Teacher:
Isolation is born when thought cuts itself off from the whole. The universe is not isolated; only the self is.

Questioner:
Can one see this self as false while living in the world?

Teacher:
One must, or there is no freedom. To see the false as false is to see that the self has no independent existence apart from thought.

Questioner:
But the self feels very real—its fears, its pleasures, its suffering.

Teacher:
A mirage feels real until you see it as a mirage. Its apparent reality does not make it water.

Questioner:
So, suffering itself is part of the false?

Teacher:
Suffering exists, but psychological suffering is sustained by thought's insistence on continuity. The universe knows birth and death, but it does not grieve.

Questioner:
That sounds almost cruel.

Teacher:
Cruelty is a human word. The universe is neither cruel nor kind; it simply is. Compassion arises when the human mind stops opposing itself to what is.

Questioner:
Is compassion then a cosmic quality?

Teacher:
It is not personal. It is the intelligence of the whole operating without division. When the self ends, that intelligence functions.

Questioner:
What role does thought play in this vast movement?

Teacher:
Thought is a small wave in an immense ocean. When it forgets its place, it imagines it is the ocean.

Questioner:
And religion, philosophy, spirituality—are they also part of this false movement?

Teacher:
When they are products of thought seeking permanence, yes. The sacred cannot be approached through belief. Belief is thought reaching for the infinite.

Questioner:
Then how does one come upon the sacred?

Teacher:
By ending the false. The sacred is not something added; it is revealed when illusion falls away.

Questioner:
Does this ending happen gradually, like cosmic evolution?

Teacher:
Evolution belongs to time. Truth is not the result of time. Insight is immediate, like lightning.

Questioner:
So, the moment one sees the false as false, the whole structure collapses?

Teacher:
Yes. Just as darkness disappears the moment there is light.

Questioner:
In that light, is there a sense of the universe acting through the mind?

Teacher:
There is no “through.” There is only action without a centre. The universe is not acting through you; the illusion of separation has ended.

Questioner:
Then what is the human being in such a state?

Teacher:
No longer merely human, and not something more. Simply part of the whole—without name, without boundary.

Questioner:
Is that freedom?

Teacher:
Freedom is not from something or towards something. It is the absence of illusion.

Questioner:
And in that absence, how does one live?

Teacher:
As the stars live—not in ambition, not in fear, not in becoming, but in order.

Questioner:
So, the great task of humanity is not to conquer the universe, but to end illusion?

Teacher:
Yes. Because the universe does not need to be conquered. It only needs to be met without the false.

Questioner:
And that meeting begins where?

Teacher:
Here. Now. In the seeing of the false as false.

In that seeing, the mind becomes vast.
Not because it has reached the cosmos,
but because it has ended what made it small.

***

Questioner:

When scientists speak of the universe, they describe vast fields of energy, galaxies forming and dissolving, matter obeying precise laws. Yet the human mind seems chaotic. Why is there such disorder in us when the universe appears so ordered?

Teacher:
Because the universe does not divide itself psychologically. Disorder appears only when thought creates a centre separate from the whole.

Questioner:
Physics tells us that everything is energy—atoms, stars, even the brain. Then why does this same energy produce conflict in us?

Teacher:
Energy in itself is neither orderly nor disorderly. Disorder arises when energy turns inward as memory seeking continuity. The brain, conditioned by experience, creates a psychological centre that resists change.

Questioner:
Is this centre—the self—something real in biological terms?

Teacher:
Biologically there is memory, pattern recognition, survival responses. Psychologically, the self is an image formed by these functions. The image mistakes itself for an entity.

Questioner:
Neuroscience speaks of the brain as a network of conditioned circuits. Is illusion embedded in these circuits?

Teacher:

Conditioning is a fact. Illusion begins when conditioning is identified as "me." The brain's activity becomes self-referential, endlessly looping in the past.

Questioner:
In physics, time is movement. Is psychological time different?

Teacher:
Psychological time is memory projecting itself as future. It is the past demanding continuity. The universe moves, but it does not become something.

Questioner:
Then becoming is uniquely human?

Teacher:
Becoming psychologically, yes. Stars are born and die, but they do not seek immortality. Only the human mind fears ending.

Questioner:
Is that fear the root of illusion?

Teacher:
Fear is both the root and the product. Fear demands security; security demands belief; belief creates illusion. The cycle sustains itself.

Questioner:
Cosmology tells us the universe is moving toward entropy—dissolution. Yet we struggle to preserve the self. Is that contradiction the cause of suffering?

Teacher:

Yes. Life moves toward ending. The self resists that movement. Conflict is born in resistance.

Questioner:
So suffering is not imposed by the universe, but created by resistance to its movement?

Teacher:
Exactly. The universe knows no sorrow. Sorrow is the cry of the self trying to remain.

Questioner:
Can the brain, which is matter, see the falseness of this resistance?

Teacher:
When the brain observes without interpretation, without naming, without escaping, it enters a different order. Neuroscience would say the habitual loops fall silent.

Questioner:
Is that silence measurable?

Teacher:
Measurement belongs to thought. But the effect is clear: the centre dissolves. When the observer is absent, there is perception without distortion.

Questioner:
Is this what you mean by seeing the false as false?

Teacher:
Yes. Seeing that the self is a construct, that becoming is illusion, that security in ideas is false. In that seeing, the false ends.

Questioner:
Does this ending affect the brain physically?

Teacher:
A brain in conflict wastes energy. A brain free of illusion is extraordinarily efficient. It functions in harmony with life.

Questioner:
Is that harmony what we call intelligence?

Teacher:
Not intelligence as cleverness or knowledge, but intelligence as order. Order not imposed, but natural—like the order of the stars.

Questioner:
Then is compassion also part of this cosmic order?

Teacher:
Compassion is intelligence acting without centre. It is not emotion; it is the absence of division.

Questioner:
Religion often speaks of God as the creator of the universe. Is that relevant here?

Teacher:
Any God created by thought is within the field of matter. The sacred is not a concept. It is the state of a mind free from illusion.

Questioner:
Is that state something personal?

Teacher:
There is no person in it. There is only attention—vast, silent, unoccupied.

Questioner:
Then what is the place of the human being in the cosmos?

Teacher:
To end illusion. Not to conquer nature, not to escape life, but to be in complete relationship with what is.

Questioner:
And that begins with?

Teacher:
With seeing.
Seeing false as false.
Not tomorrow.
Now.

When the false ends, the mind is no longer separate from the universe.
Not because it has merged with something greater,
but because the barrier it imagined was never real.

In that freedom,
the cosmos is not out there.
It is here—
alive, intelligent, immeasurable.

*****

The Mind That Does Not Accumulate.

To know oneself without accumulation is to live without continuity.
Accumulation is continuity—of memory, of experience, of identity, of becoming something. The moment the mind accumulates, it is already moving away from direct perception and entering the field of the known.

Self-knowing, in the sense we are speaking of, is not self-knowledge. Self-knowledge is accumulated knowledge about oneself— "I am this kind of person," "I have these tendencies," "I have overcome this fear." All that belongs to time. Self-knowing is the act of seeing oneself from moment to moment, without carrying over what has been seen. In that seeing, there is no residue.

A mind that carries no residue has no psychological continuity. Such a mind dies to each moment as it lives. And it is only such a mind that can approach the fact of death.

Death is something the mind does not know. It has never known it. What it knows are ideas about death—biological explanations, religious beliefs, hopes of continuity, fears of extinction. All these are projections of the known. They are not death.

The mind cannot conceive death because conception is born of memory, and death is the ending of memory as continuity. Thought can imagine death, describe it, symbolise it, turn it into heaven, hell, rebirth, or annihilation—but imagination is still within the field of thought. And thought can never touch what is not of time.

To see the fact of death, the mind must be free of accumulation. Fear is accumulation. Belief is accumulation. Hope is accumulation. Experience is accumulation. As long as the mind carries these, it cannot look. It is already protecting itself.

When the mind says, “I want to experience death,” it has already moved away from death. Experience implies an experiencer, and where there is an experiencer, there is continuity. Death is the ending of the experiencer.

So, the mind must come upon death without wanting to experience it, without naming it, without approaching it as something strange or mysterious. The moment it says, “This is strange, this is extraordinary,” thought has entered.

Can the mind look at something it has never known?
Not by recognition, not by comparison, not by memory—but by complete attention.

In such attention there is no observer separate from what is observed. There is no centre accumulating impressions. There is only looking.

When the mind looks without accumulation, without the burden of thought, duality ends. There is no “me” looking at death. There is only the ending of the known.

And in that ending, death is not something opposed to life. Life and death are not two. The moment life is burdened with accumulation, death becomes frightening. But when life is lived without psychological continuity, death is not an event at the end; it is part of living.

A mind that dies to the past each moment has already understood death. Not intellectually, not emotionally—but actually. Such a mind does not ask what comes after death, because it is not concerned with continuity. It is concerned only with seeing what is.

In that seeing, there is freedom—not from death, but from fear. And where there is no fear, there is no duality. There is only a state of mind that is completely alive, completely empty, and therefore capable of looking at the unknown without turning it into the known.

That is the beauty of a mind that knows itself without accumulation.

***

Living Without Continuity

Questioner:
You say that self-knowing without accumulation has no continuity. What do you mean by accumulation in this context?

Teacher:
Accumulation is the gathering of psychological residue—memories, experiences, conclusions, images about oneself. The moment the mind says, "I have understood," and carries that forward, accumulation has begun.

Questioner:
But is self-knowledge not important?

Teacher:
Self-knowledge, as it is usually understood, is knowledge about oneself. That knowledge is always of the past. Self-knowing, on the other hand, is seeing oneself from moment to moment, without retaining what has been seen.

Questioner:
So self-knowing has no continuity?

Teacher:
Psychological continuity comes from accumulation. When there is no accumulation, there is no continuity. The mind is fresh each moment.

Questioner:
That sounds very unstable. How can one live without continuity?

Teacher:
Only the image seeks continuity. Life itself is movement, not continuity. The river flows, but it does not cling to yesterday's water.

Questioner:
Then what is death in this context?

Teacher:
Death is something the mind does not know. It has never known it. What the mind knows are ideas about death—beliefs, explanations, fears, hopes.

Questioner:
But surely, we all know that death will come.

Teacher:
We know it as an idea, not as a fact. The fact of death is the ending of the known. Thought cannot conceive the ending of itself.

Questioner:
Is that why death creates fear?

Teacher:

Yes. Fear arises because the mind is attached to continuity. It wants to go on—psychologically, as the "me." Death threatens that movement.

Questioner:
Can the mind look at death without fear?

Teacher:
Only when it is free from accumulation. Fear itself is accumulation. Belief is accumulation. Hope is accumulation. As long as the mind carries these, it cannot look.

Questioner:
Often one feels curious about death, wanting to experience it or understand it.

Teacher:
The moment you want to experience death; it is no longer death. Experience implies an experiencer. Where there is an experiencer, there is continuity.

Questioner:
So, death cannot be experienced?

Teacher:
That which ends the experiencer cannot be experienced by the experiencer. Thought wants to make death into an experience so that it can remain.

Questioner:
Then how can the mind approach death at all?

Teacher:
Not by approaching. Not by seeking. But by ending what prevents seeing. When the mind is free of accumulation, it is capable of looking at something it has never known.

Questioner:

Looking without recognition?

Teacher:
Yes. Recognition is the past interfering. When there is recognition, there is no seeing.

Questioner:
Is this kind of looking difficult?

Teacher:
Difficulty exists only when there is resistance. When the mind does not resist, does not escape, does not name, looking is effortless.

Questioner:
What happens when the mind looks in this way?

Teacher:
The mind is no longer carrying the burden of thought. There is no centre observing. Therefore, there is no duality—no observer and observed.

Questioner:
Does that mean life and death are not opposites?

Teacher:
They are opposites only when life is burdened with accumulation. When life is lived without psychological continuity, death is part of living.

Questioner:
So, one can die every day?

Teacher:
Not as an idea. But actually—by ending the past each moment. Such a mind is always new.

Questioner:

And such a mind has no fear of death?

Teacher:
Fear exists only when there is something to lose. A mind that does not accumulate has nothing to lose.

Questioner:
Then what remains?

Teacher:
Do not ask what remains. That question is again the desire for continuity. When the false ends, what is true does not need a name.

Questioner:
So, self-knowing without accumulation is freedom?

Teacher:
It is freedom from fear, freedom from duality, freedom from the burden of the known. And only such a mind can look at the unknown without turning it into the known.

That is the beauty of living without continuity.

***

Questioner:
When I look at the universe—the birth of stars, the collapse of galaxies, the immense stretches of time—death seems natural there. Yet for human beings it is terrifying. Why is death so simple in the cosmos and so frightening to us?

Teacher:
Because the universe does not cling to continuity. Only the human mind does.

Questioner:
But continuity seems natural—life flowing from yesterday to today.

Teacher:
That is physical continuity. Psychologically, continuity is created by accumulation. The mind carries yesterday forward as "me," as memory, as experience.

Questioner:
In astronomy, everything is movement—nothing remains. Even stars die.

Teacher:
Yes. The universe is in constant ending. But it does not resist its own ending. Resistance is born only when thought seeks permanence.

Questioner:
Is that why death becomes fear?

Teacher:
Fear is the demand for continuity. The self wants to go on, to know, to be certain. Death offers no certainty.

Questioner:
Science says matter is conserved, energy transforms. Does anything truly end?

Teacher:
Transformation is not continuity of identity. Energy changes form, but it does not say, "I must remain what I am."

Questioner:
So, the problem is not ending, but identification?

Teacher:
Exactly. The mind identifies with form, with memory, with experience. From that identification arises the illusion of a permanent self.

Questioner:
Is this self biologically real?

Teacher:
Biologically there is memory, conditioning, survival response. Psychologically the self is an image formed by these processes. The image mistakes itself for an entity.

Questioner:
Cosmology speaks of time as a dimension. Is psychological time different?

Teacher:
Psychological time is thought projecting the past into the future. It is memory seeking continuation.

Questioner:
Then death is the ending of psychological time?

Teacher:
Yes. And that is why thought cannot conceive it. Thought is time.

Questioner:
Yet the mind wants to understand death, to experience it.

Teacher:
The moment the mind seeks to experience death, it has denied death. Experience implies continuity of the experiencer.

Questioner:
So, death cannot be experienced?

Teacher:
That which ends the experiencer cannot be experienced by the experiencer. The universe does not experience its own ending; it simply ends and begins anew.

Questioner:
Can the human mind look at death as the universe does?

Teacher:
Only when it ceases to accumulate. Accumulation creates weight. The cosmos is light.

Questioner:
Is accumulation the cause of psychological burden?

Teacher:
Yes. Memory, belief, fear, hope—these are accumulations. They give the illusion of security.

Questioner:
And without accumulation?

Teacher:
The mind has no continuity. It dies to each moment.

Questioner:
That sounds like annihilation.

Teacher:
Only to the self. To life, it is renewal.

Questioner:
In physics, entropy increases—systems dissolve. Is psychological dissolution necessary?

Teacher:
As long as the mind resists dissolution, it lives in disorder. Order comes when resistance ends.

Questioner:
So, death is not disorder?

Teacher:
Death is part of order. Disorder is the mind refusing to end.

Questioner:
What happens when the mind looks at death without fear?

Teacher:
There is no “what happens.” The question itself comes from continuity. There is only seeing.

Questioner:
And in that seeing?

Teacher:
The observer is absent. There is no duality between life and death.

Questioner:
Then life and death are one movement?

Teacher:
As birth and decay are one movement in the stars, so living and dying are one movement in a mind free of accumulation.

Questioner:
Is such a mind rare?

Teacher:
Rarity is not the point. Possibility is.

Questioner:
And that possibility begins where?

Teacher:
Now. In ending what is carried.

When the mind no longer clings to yesterday,
death is no longer in the future.

It is present in living.

And in that presence,
there is no fear,
no division,
no continuity.

Only vastness—
not of space,
but of freedom.

***

A mind that does not accumulate is not an idea.
It is not something to be cultivated or remembered.

It shows itself in relationship.

In the act of listening,
in the way one looks,
in the response that is not carried over from yesterday.

If there is memory in listening,
there is no listening.

And where there is accumulation,
there is distortion.

*****

Thought, Matter and the silence beyond

When we ask, “What is matter?” we are not asking for a scientific definition. Science can categorise matter as atoms, energy, fields, forces. But Krishnamurti’s question is of a totally different order.
He is asking: What is the essence of that which becomes the world of our experience?
And further: Is there something beyond this movement?

He begins by pointing out something very simple but revolutionary:
Thought itself is a material process.
Thought arises from the brain; the brain is matter; therefore, thought is matter.
What thought produces—religions, images, beliefs, temples, rituals, psychological structures—is also matter. Even the idea of God, when formulated by thought, becomes a material projection, a creation of the brain.

So, he says:

- Everything thought has put together is matter.
- The technological world is matter.
- The psychological world of images, fears, hopes, pleasures is matter.
- The so-called spiritual projections—heaven, liberation, omnipotence—are also matter because thought has created them.

This is a radical insight.
We are conditioned to think that the “inner world” is somehow separate from the “outer world,” that one is subtle, divine, ethereal, while the other is physical.

But for Krishnamurti, the division is false.
Both worlds are constructed by thought, and therefore both are within the field of matter.

Can matter be described?

He asks, “What is matter? Can it be described?”
To describe something is to use thought.
The moment you describe, you have already moved away from direct perception.
The description becomes a symbol, an image—again, matter.

So, to describe matter is to remain within the field of matter.
The word is not the thing; the word matter is not matter.
Yet the mind is trapped in words, formulas, and descriptions.

Krishnamurti is pointing out a deeper thing:

As long as you look through the movement of thought, you can only perceive matter, never what may be beyond it.

Thought, being material, can never touch the immaterial.
It can imagine it, project it, hope for it—but imagination is still matter.

Is there anything beyond matter?

This question cannot be answered by thought.
Thought can speculate, debate, build philosophies, invent gods—but all that is still within the field of matter.

So, the question is not:
“Is there something beyond matter?”
but rather:

“Can the mind be free of the movement of matter-called-thought?”

If thought is silent—not suppressed, not controlled, but naturally quiet—
then perhaps there is a perception which is not of matter.
A perception that is not conditioned by the past, not shaped by memory.
A perception without the observer.

In that silence, Krishnamurti often said, there is a quality of mind that is untouched by thought, untouched by the material process.
He did not name it, because naming would again bring it into the field of thought, and therefore into matter.

He would simply say:

“When thought ends, something else begins—something that cannot be described.”

Not mystical, not supernatural—
but a state of complete order, complete clarity, complete emptiness.

The essential point

Krishnamurti is inviting you to see:

- Thought = matter
- Description = matter
- Imagination = matter
- The entire psychological structure = matter

So, what then is the mind that is free of matter?

This cannot be told; it can only be discovered in direct perception when thought is completely still.

***

MATTER, THOUGHT, AND THE OTHER DIMENSION OF MIND

We live in a world that is almost entirely shaped by thought. Our cities, our religions, our relationships, our fears, our pleasures, our conclusions about life—all this is the product of thought. Yet very few have asked what thought itself is. And even fewer have asked a far deeper question: Is there anything in our life that is not the product of thought? Is there anything untouched by matter?

This inquiry begins when we look, not through the lens of philosophy or belief, but with the simplicity of a mind that wants to see, that wants to understand the very nature of its own functioning.

Thought as a Material Process

Thought is born of memory. Memory is the residue of experience. Experience is registered by the brain. The brain is matter. Therefore, thought is matter.

It is not a poetic statement; it is a fact. The brain, with its immense complexity, is still an organ of the body—subject to chemicals, electricity, and the laws of nature. Thought is the movement of this brain, the movement of the known.

When we understand this deeply, not merely as an idea, a tremendous thing happens:
everything that thought has created becomes recognized as matter.

Whether it is a temple or a telescope, an image of God or an image of the self, an ideology or a scientific formula—each is a movement of thought, and therefore each belongs to the field of matter.

This realisation wipes away the artificial division between the psychological and the physical. They are both projections of the same movement.

The Psychological World Is Also Matter

We imagine that the inner world—the world of desire, fear, sorrow, hope—belongs to a different dimension than the world of things. We think the mind's creations are subtle, intangible, spiritual, or sacred. But Krishnamurti points out that every movement of thought, whether gross or refined, belongs to the same stream.

Your image of yourself is matter.
Your ambition, your hurt, your loneliness—they are all patterns held in the material brain.
Even the idea of the "higher self", the "soul", or "God" as conceived by thought is matter.

This is not a cynical statement. It is not meant to destroy belief. It is an invitation to see the profound limitation of thought:
Thought can only move within the field of matter.

It cannot touch that which is not created by the brain.

Can Matter Be Described?

When we ask, “What is matter?” we immediately reach for description. The physicist describes matter as quarks and energy fields. The philosopher describes it as substance. The theologian may oppose matter with spirit.

But description is the movement of thought. And the moment you describe, you are no longer looking—you are repeating. When you describe matter, the description itself becomes matter, because it is produced by thought.

Krishnamurti is indicating something subtle:
The instant you define, you limit. The instant you describe, you impose the movement of the known on the unknown.

Therefore, the question “What is matter?” is unanswerable by thought.
Thought cannot go beyond itself.

Is There Anything Beyond Thought?

This question opens the door to a dimension which cannot be touched by belief, speculation, or imagination. All imagination is matter. All hope is matter. All theological invention is matter.

So, the question is not: “Is there something beyond matter?”
The real question is: Can the mind be free of the movement of matter?

If the mind remains within the movement of thought, whatever it seeks will be yet another product of thought. The search for “something beyond matter” becomes another projection within matter.

Therefore, for Krishnamurti, the essential thing is not the search for the beyond, but the understanding of the movement of thought.

The Ending of Thought's Dominance

Thought has its necessary place—technology, communication, planning. But psychologically, thought becomes the tyrant. It creates the "me", the centre, the observer. It builds the walls of fear and pleasure. It sustains comparison, ambition, sorrow.

When one sees fully that this entire psychological structure is matter and nothing more, there is a profound shift.
One no longer seeks security in images, beliefs, or experiences.
One sees them as illusions built by thought.

Then arises the question:
Can thought fall completely silent?

Not through control, suppression, discipline, or practice—because all such efforts are still the movement of thought.

A silence born of effort is still matter rearranged.

Krishnamurti says silence comes when thought sees its own limitation.
When thought understands that it cannot go beyond itself, it naturally subsides.

In that moment, the mind is utterly still—not artificially, but organically, naturally.

A Mind That Is Not Bound to Matter

When thought is quiet—not forced, not suppressed, not pushed aside—then the mind is open to something wholly different.

A mind that is completely still may touch a dimension that is not matter.

Krishnamurti never defined it.
He refused to give it a name.
For naming is the beginning of corruption.

But he hinted:

- There is a quality of immensity.
- A sense of wholeness, without fragmentation.
- A sense of compassion that is not born of thought.
- A sense of intelligence that is not the product of knowledge.

This is not mystical, not supernatural.
It is the natural flowering of a mind that has understood itself totally.

The Door Opens When Thought Ends

So, the question, "Is there anything beyond matter?" is answered only when the mind sees that it cannot seek the answer.
Any search is the movement of matter.
Any image of the "beyond" is matter.
Any conclusion is matter.

But when thought ends—without effort, without motive—there is a perception that is not of thought.

In that perception, there is a freedom that cannot be described.
A silence that cannot be captured in words.
A dimension untouched by the brain's movement.

Krishnamurti would say:

"Where thought ends, the other begins."

Not as an idea, but as a fact to be discovered only in the living moment.

***

Thought, Matter, and the Silence Beyond

Human beings have lived for millennia within the field of matter. Our bodies are matter, our environment is matter, and—though rarely understood—our psychological world is also the movement of matter. When we inquire into this fact with seriousness, not merely as a philosophical exercise, a profound transformation takes place. We begin to see the entire structure of the self and its activities in a completely new way.

Thought as a Material Movement

Thought arises from memory stored in the brain. Memory is the residue of experience, and experience is registered by a physical organism. Therefore, thought is a material process. It has weight, structure, momentum, continuity. What thought creates—whether an image of God, a national identity, a scientific theory, or a personal hurt—is still within the same fabric.

Once this is seen, the traditional division between “outer world” and “inner world” collapses.
The outer expresses itself as action and technology; the inner expresses itself as fear, desire, comparison, and belief. Both are the operations of thought; both are matter in different forms.

This understanding is not merely intellectual. It shatters the illusion that the psychological world is somehow sacred, beyond nature, or essentially different from the physical world.

The Question: What Is Matter?

When we ask, what is matter? we immediately reach for descriptions. But a description is the movement of thought, and thought belongs to the very thing it is describing. The moment matter is described; it has already been reduced to thought’s categories—to words, concepts, and theories.

This means that thought cannot stand outside matter to define it. Thought is always too close, too involved; it is made of the same substance.

So, the deeper question is not what matter is, but whether the mind can observe without reducing everything to the movement of thought.

Is There Anything Beyond Matter?

This question cannot be answered through thinking. Thought can imagine, hope, or believe that something exists beyond matter, but imagination is still matter; belief is still matter. Whatever thought projects, however refined, is still within the same field.

Therefore, the inquiry into what may lie beyond matter is only possible when thought sees its own limitation. Only then is there the possibility of a different dimension.

This is not mystical. It is simply the recognition that the tool we are using—thought—cannot measure or touch that which is not of its own creation.

The Ending of Thought's Dominance

We are not concerned with suppressing thought or controlling it. Such efforts only strengthen the centre that wishes to control, and that centre is also thought. But when thought perceives its own boundaries—sees that it cannot go further than the field of matter—it becomes quiet.

This quietness is not manufactured. It comes into being naturally when thought sees the truth about itself.

In that stillness, the mind is no longer driven by the past, no longer shaped by memory. It is empty of the psychological movement that creates conflict. The emptiness is not a void; it is a state of tremendous clarity and alertness.

A Mind Not of Matter

When thought falls silent, not temporarily but fundamentally, there may be the awakening of a quality that does not belong to the movement of matter. Krishnamurti never gave it a name, because naming would once again bring it into the field of thought.

But he spoke of:

- an intelligence that is not born of knowledge,

- a compassion that is not the product of emotion,
- a perception that is instantaneous, whole, and non-divisive.

These are not states to be cultivated. They are the natural flowering of a mind that has understood the total movement of thought and is therefore free of its compulsions.

The Door Opens in Silence

So, the essential question is not whether there is something beyond matter, but whether the mind can be free from the movement of thought which is matter. When thought ends, in complete natural stillness, without effort or reward, the mind stands in a different order altogether.

That which is beyond matter cannot be described, pursued, or imagined.
But it can be touched when the noise of thought has completely subsided.

In the clarity of that silence, there is a sense of immensity—a quality of mind that is not created by thought, not shaped by time, and not bound to the material process.

That silence is the doorway.

*****

The Ground That Thought Cannot Enter

There is an existence that is utterly beyond the reach of thought—
not higher, not deeper, not sacred,
but outside the whole field of the mind altogether.

Thought has polluted everything it touches:
it has corrupted love into attachment,
turned intelligence into cunning,
made truth into ideology,
and reduced the vastness of life
into the narrow confines of the "me."

Whatever thought calls "reality"
is only the echo of its own noise.

But there is a reality
that no amount of seeking, praying, meditating, disciplining,
or sacrificing will ever uncover—
because all such movements arise from thought,
and thought breeds illusion.

To come upon that reality,
the total structure of the self must die.
Not gradually, not through practice,
not through the slow decay of time—
but instantly, like lightning striking a dry tree.

When the self ends completely—
not modified, not purified,
but ended—
there is a dimension that thought has never touched.
A dimension that is not born,
does not evolve,

and cannot be destroyed.

It is not mystical;
it is not spiritual;
it is not the “cosmos” imagined by philosophers or physicists.
Those are still toys of the mind.

This is the real—the uncreated.
It has no centre, no boundary, no form.
It does not belong to you or to anyone.
You cannot invite it,
you cannot prepare for it,
you cannot contain it.

It comes only when the entire movement of becoming ends.
When the mind stands naked—
stripped of knowledge, stripped of belief,
stripped of every illusion it has worshipped—
then, in that absolute emptiness,
that otherness explodes.

And the moment you try to remember it,
describe it,
or hold it—
it is gone.

Because the word is never the real.
The thinker is the barrier.
When the thinker ends,
only then does the timeless, the uncreated,
the true existence stands in its own unimaginable purity.

*****

One is so frightened to strip oneself of everything.

Why is one frightened to strip oneself of everything?
Because everything that one holds—one's beliefs, one's achievements, one's wounds, one's hopes, one's knowledge, one's conclusions—
is what gives the illusion of psychological safety.

To strip oneself of everything is to stand utterly naked before life.
And the mind trembles at the very hint of such exposure.

The mind has spent years, decades, perhaps lifetimes, constructing its shelter—
the shelter of experience, of identity, of ideology.
These structures are the walls behind which thought hides.
Behind them it feels secure, protected, established.

But these walls are also its prison.

To strip oneself of these walls is to be without a centre, without a ground, without the crutches of the known.
So naturally, the mind resists.
It clings to the familiar, even if the familiar is suffering.
It would rather carry the weight of its memories than face the vastness of the unknown.

We are frightened because we are those accumulations.

Take away your name, your past, your achievements, your beliefs, your hurts—
what remains?

A space the mind cannot define, cannot measure, cannot control.
And what it cannot control, it fears.

Thought whispers:
“If I give up what I have been, I will be nothing.”
“If I drop my beliefs, I will be lost.”
“If I let go of my hurts, I will have no identity.”
“If I cease to become, I will cease to exist.”

So, the mind hangs on, not because what it holds is valuable, but because what lies beyond is unimaginable.

This fear is the fear of seeing oneself without distortion.
It is the fear of facing the emptiness inside—
an emptiness we have been escaping through pleasure, through ambition, through ideals, through comparison, through activity.

But look at this fear closely, without running from it.
See what it is:
the fear of letting the known end.

And unless the known ends, the new cannot be.
Unless illusion is stripped away, truth cannot flower.

The mind thinks that stripping itself will lead to nothingness.
But the nothingness it fears is not destruction—
it is freedom from the burden of what has been.

To strip oneself of everything is not a deliberate act—
you cannot peel away beliefs and memories like removing garments.
Any attempt to do so becomes another achievement of the self.

Stripping happens naturally when the mind sees the falseness of what it clings to.
When it sees that beliefs divide, that ideals create conflict, that knowledge cannot penetrate the depths of sorrow, that self-image is always wounded—
then in the very seeing, there is a dropping away.

Fear ends when you see that what you are afraid to lose was never real security.

To be nothing—no label, no image, no conclusion—
is not poverty, but immense richness.
It is the freedom of a mind that carries no weight.
A mind that can look, listen, love.

When everything is stripped away,
what remains is not emptiness,
but a silence untouched by time—
a clarity that is not cultivated—
a beauty that is not thought-made.

And from that emptiness,
life begins anew.

***

A Dialogue

“One is so frightened to strip oneself of everything.”

Questioner:
Sir, you said the other day that one must strip oneself of everything—every belief, every conclusion, every form of psychological accumulation.
But when I hear that, I feel a deep fear.

One is so frightened to strip oneself of everything.
Why is it so?

Teacher:
Let us go slowly.
First of all, who is the one that is frightened?
Is it something different from the things it is frightened to lose?
Or is fear born out of the very things it clings to?

You see the difference, sir?

If the "me" who is frightened is itself made of memories, hurts, beliefs, experiences, then that very structure is generating fear.
So, the one who is frightened is not separate from what it holds on to.

Questioner:
I do not fully understand.
Are you saying the fear and the thing I cling to are the same?

Teacher:
Exactly, sir.
The fear exists because you cling.
And you cling because you imagine that without these accumulations you will be nothing.
So, the mind protects its own content.

The fear is the content; the content is the fear.

Questioner:
But these things—my beliefs, my memories, my experiences—they give me a sense of identity.
Without them I feel lost.

Teacher:
Quite right.
That is the point.
The mind has identified itself with its own movement of accumulation.
It is its memories, its hurts, its traditions.
The “me” is nothing but this gathering of the past.

Now, when you say, “I am frightened to strip myself of everything,” you are really saying:
“I am frightened that the ‘me’ will end.”

So, the fear is the fear of psychological death.

Questioner:
Yes, that is exactly it.
It feels like dying.

Teacher:
It is a dying.
Not of the body, but of the psychological structure we have built through time.
And the mind trembles before that death because it only knows how to live in terms of continuity.

But, sir, continuity is the very root of suffering.
In continuity there is the carrying over of fear, of pleasure, of hurt.
To see this is already the beginning of freedom.

Questioner:
Still, the mind resists.
It says, “If I give all this up, what will remain?”

Teacher:
Listen to that question.
What will remain?
Who is asking it?
It is again the same centre demanding security.
It wants a guarantee— "Tell me what I will find when I let go."

That very demand prevents letting go.

You understand?

Truth comes only when the mind is not seeking anything— not even safety.

Questioner:
So how does one go beyond this fear?

Teacher:
You cannot go beyond it.
You can only look at it.
Look at fear without the desire to escape, without naming it, without rationalising it.

If you look at fear totally, without any movement away from it, then in that very looking the fear unfolds, reveals its content, and ends.

Because the observer who was resisting the fear is no longer separate from the fear.

Questioner:
So, the ending of fear happens naturally in that observation?

Teacher:

Not “naturally.”
Not “unnaturally.”
It happens when there is pure attention.

Attention is the stripping.
Attention is the fire that burns away the false.

And when the false goes, there is nothing to fear.

Then you stand alone—not isolated, not lonely—alone in the sense of all-one, whole, untouched by the past.

Questioner:
Sir… is this what you mean by freedom?

Teacher:
Yes, sir.
Freedom is the ending of the known.
And only a mind that has stripped itself of everything it has gathered can discover that extraordinary state where there is no fear, no centre, no shadow of the past.

That is the beginning of a new life.

*****

When the immeasurable is not named

In total attention there is an ending of the observer. There is no centre from which one looks, no experiencer gathering an experience. In that attention, something comes into being which is not the result of thought, time, or cultivation. It is not created by effort, nor summoned by practice. It is simply there—whole, immeasurable, without name.

To call it creation is already to step away from it. The word points, but it does not contain. If one prefers another word—energy, immensity, the sacred, the timeless—that too is only a sound, a symbol. The thing itself is not in the word. The moment it is named, it has already been reduced to an idea, and an idea is always smaller than what is.

So, the question arises: how can one express that total energy?
One cannot. Expression belongs to thought, and thought is limited. Thought can describe, compare, poetise, analyse—but it cannot hold the immeasurable. The immeasurable is not something to be conveyed; it is something to be be.

When such energy is translated into words, images, music, or symbols, what is conveyed is not the thing itself but a shadow of it. And the shadow can easily be mistaken for the substance. That is why religions crystallise into dogma, why living insight becomes scripture, why truth becomes an institution. Expression, once taken as truth, becomes a barrier to truth.

Then what value has expression at all?

Expression may have value only as a pointer, never as the thing pointed to. Like a signpost, it indicates a direction, but it is not the destination. For one who has not tasted this total attention, words may awaken curiosity, seriousness, a sense of inquiry. But for one who has understood—who has seen without the observer—expression loses its urgency, its authority, its charm.

Such a person does not feel compelled to communicate, to convince, to teach. Not because of indifference, but because there is no centre demanding expression. Silence is not suppression; it is the natural state when there is nothing to translate.

Then one may ask: Will such a person still go to museums, to concerts, to poetry, to art?

Perhaps—but not in search of fulfilment. Art, music, nature may be seen with great intensity, with affection, with sensitivity. But they are no longer escapes, stimulants, or substitutes. Beauty is not sought; it is already there in attention itself. When one has drunk deeply at the fountain, the urge to collect droplets disappears.

This does not make life barren or dry. On the contrary, it makes it extraordinarily rich—without accumulation. There is joy without cause, movement without direction, creation without the creator.

And in that state, expression has no significance for oneself. If expression happens, it happens like a flower blooms—not to communicate, not to achieve, not to leave a mark, but because blooming is its nature. And if there is no expression, that too is complete.

The real question, then, is not how to express the immeasurable, but whether the mind is willing to remain with what cannot be expressed—without translating it, without escaping from it, without turning it into something usable.

In that staying, there is total attention.
And in that attention, there is the sacred—not spoken, not shown, not shared—yet endlessly alive.

*****

In the Silence of Not Knowing

Do you know anything, except physically and technologically? Do you know anything else – about the future, about anything? Do you ever say, 'I don't know,' and remain in that state of not-knowing, not trying to go beyond it or trying to find a way out so that you will know? Do you ever feel that state of 'I don't know'? – JK

The State of not Knowing: Apart from physical and technological knowledge—which is necessary in its own field—do we actually know anything at all? We know how to use machines, how to calculate, how to cure certain diseases, how to predict material outcomes within limited fields. But psychologically, inwardly, do we really know? Or do we merely repeat what has been told, what has been accumulated as memory, tradition, belief, and experience?

When one asks about the future, about life, about death, about truth, about God, one usually answers from the known. The mind is uncomfortable with uncertainty. It wants conclusions, assurances, directions. So, it moves quickly to beliefs, theories, hopes, and ideals. In doing so, it avoids the simple fact: I do not know.

To say "I do not know" is not an act of despair; nor is it a clever statement. It is a fact. But can the mind remain with that fact without escaping from it? Usually, the moment we say "I don't know," thought immediately begins to search—for an explanation, a teacher, a book, a system, a future promise. The not-knowing is intolerable because it offers no ground to stand on.

Yet it is precisely in this state of not-knowing that something entirely different can take place.

Not-knowing is not ignorance. Ignorance is the absence of information where information is needed. Not-knowing, in the psychological sense, is the ending of false knowledge—the knowledge that thought claims about things it cannot possibly know: the future of the psyche, the meaning of life, the nature of truth.

To remain in not-knowing requires great humility—not the humility of words, but the humility of perception. The mind then is no longer burdened by conclusions. It is no longer projecting images of what should be. It is silent—not through discipline, not through control, but because it sees the futility of its own movement.

In that silence, there is attention. And attention is not the product of knowledge.

When the mind truly says, "I do not know," and does not move away from it, there is an extraordinary freedom. The mind is no longer caught in becoming, in becoming something tomorrow. There is no future projected psychologically. Time, as becoming, comes to an end.

Then learning begins—not learning in the sense of accumulating information, but learning as direct perception. Such learning is alive, moving, fresh. It is not repeatable. It cannot be stored.

So, the question is not whether we should say "I don't know." The question is whether the mind can live in not-knowing—without fear, without hope, without escape. Only then is the mind innocent. And innocence is the ground of intelligence.

That intelligence does not promise the future.
It does not offer comfort.
But it sees what is.

And in seeing what is, without the interference of the known, there is truth.

*****

The false Sustains Violence

Violence does not begin with weapons, armies, or physical aggression.
It begins much earlier — in the mind.

The moment thought creates an image, violence has already begun.

The image may be crude or refined.
It may be personal or collective.
It may be called myself, my belief, my nation, my religion, my experience, my wound, my achievement.
But whatever its name, the image is a construction of thought, and thought is always the past.

Where there is an image, there is division.
And where there is division, conflict is inevitable.

The Birth of the "Me"

The self — the me — is not an entity.
It is not something independent or real in itself.
It is a bundle of images held together by memory.

"I am hurt."
"I am important."
"I am successful."
"I am a victim."
"I am spiritual."

These are not facts; they are images sustained by repetition.
The mind identifies with them and calls that identification living.

But identification is exclusion.
The moment you say “I am,” you are separating yourself from the rest of life.

This separation is violence.

Images and Relationship

Relationship exists only when there is contact.
But images prevent contact.

You do not meet another human being.
You meet your image of them — and they meet their image of you.

Between these two images there is reaction, expectation, fear, domination, submission.
This entire movement is called relationship, but it is not relationship at all.

It is the interaction of illusions.

Where images operate, love cannot exist.
Because love is not of the past, and images are entirely made of the past.

Violence as a Way of Living

Violence is not merely physical harm.
It is comparison.
It is ambition.
It is competition.
It is the urge to become something at the expense of another.

Society encourages this violence and calls it normal.
It rewards achievement, success, superiority, national pride.
And human beings accept this pattern because it gives the self a sense of importance.

But a mind that lives through images must inevitably be violent —
toward others, toward nature, and toward itself.

The False Sustains Violence

What is false is not merely incorrect belief.
The false is the very structure of image-making.

Thought, seeking security, creates images and clings to them.
Those images promise continuity, identity, safety.
But they are false because they are impermanent, fragmentary, and divisive.

The false kills the true — not metaphorically, but actually.

As long as the false operates, true living cannot take place.
True living requires openness, sensitivity, vulnerability —
all of which are destroyed by images.

Seeing the False As False

The ending of violence does not come through ideals of non-violence.
An ideal is only another image.

Violence ends only when the mind sees the falseness of images —
not intellectually, not philosophically,
but directly, as one sees danger.

When you see that an image is false, you do not gradually let it go.
It drops away.

And in that dropping away, there is no effort, no struggle, no becoming.

Living Without Images

To live without images is to live without the self.
Not physically, but psychologically.

Such living is not passive.
It is extraordinarily alive.

There is attention without centre.
Relationship without memory.
Action without motive.

This is true living —
not opposed to death,
not afraid of ending,
not dependent on continuity.

Where the false ends, the true is.
And where the true is, violence has no place.

***

A Dialogue

Questioner:
You say that violence does not begin with physical aggression but in the mind itself. That seems rather abstract. Surely violence is something visible — killing, war, cruelty.

Teacher:
What is visible is only the final expression. We are asking about the source. If you do not understand the source, you will merely treat the symptom.

Tell me, when does violence actually begin?

Questioner:
Perhaps when anger arises? Or hatred?

Teacher:
Look more closely. Before anger or hatred, what is there?

Questioner:
There is usually a feeling of being hurt, or threatened.

Teacher:
And what is hurt? Is it the body, or something else?

Questioner:
It is psychological — my pride, my image, my sense of myself.

Teacher:
Exactly. So, violence begins with the image one has about oneself.
The moment thought creates an image — me, mine, what I am, what I should be — violence has already begun.

Questioner:
Are you saying that the image itself is violence?

Teacher:
The image creates division.

And division is the root of conflict.

Where there is an image, there is separation — between me and you, us and them, what is and what should be.
That separation is not innocent. It breeds comparison, fear, competition, domination.

This whole movement is violence.

Questioner:
But surely one must have some sense of oneself to function in the world.

Teacher:
To function practically, yes — a name, an address, a skill.
But psychologically, the image is not necessary.

The self — the me — is not an entity.
It is a bundle of memories, experiences, identifications, wounds, ambitions, held together by thought.

Thought calls this bundle me and demands continuity for it.

Questioner:
So, the self is only memory?

Teacher:
Memory plus identification.
“I am hurt.”
“I am successful.”
“I am important.”
“I am spiritual.”

These are not facts; they are conclusions sustained by repetition.

The mind identifies with them and calls that identification living.

But identification is exclusion.
The moment you identify, you divide yourself from the rest of life.

Questioner:
How does this division affect relationship?

Teacher:
Relationship exists only where there is contact.
But images prevent contact.

You do not meet another human being.
You meet your image of them — and they meet their image of you.

Between these images there is reaction, expectation, fear, domination, submission.
That interaction is called relationship, but it is not relationship at all.

It is the interaction of illusions.

Questioner:
Are you saying love is impossible where images exist?

Teacher:
Love is not of the past.
Images are entirely of the past.

Where images operate, love cannot exist.
Because love requires openness, vulnerability, sensitivity — and images exist precisely to protect, to defend, to insulate.

Questioner:
But society is built on images — status, success, national identity, religion.

Teacher:
Yes. And society calls this normal.

Competition is called progress.
Ambition is called virtue.
National pride is called patriotism.

All this strengthens the self.
And a self-centred mind must be violent — toward others, toward nature, and toward itself.

Questioner:
So, violence is not merely physical harm?

Teacher:
Violence is comparison.
Violence is ambition.
Violence is the urge to become something at the expense of another.

Physical violence is only the gross expression of a way of living that is already violent.

Questioner:
You use the word false very strongly. What exactly is false here?

Teacher:
The false is not merely an incorrect belief.
The false is the entire structure of image-making.

Thought, seeking psychological security, creates images and clings to them.
Those images promise safety, identity, continuity.

But they are false because they are fragmentary, impermanent, and divisive.

Questioner:
You said earlier that the false kills the true. What do you mean by that?

Teacher:
True living requires openness, sensitivity, direct contact with life.
Images destroy that contact.

As long as the false operates, true living cannot take place.
Not symbolically — actually.

The false occupies the mind completely, leaving no space for truth.

Questioner:
Can the false be ended by cultivating non-violence or right ideals?

Teacher:
An ideal is only another image.
Non-violence as an ideal is still violence.

Violence ends only when the mind sees the falseness of images —
not intellectually, not philosophically, but directly, as one sees danger.

Questioner:
And when one sees this falseness, what happens?

Teacher:
When you see that something is false, you do not gradually abandon it.
It drops away.

There is no effort in that seeing.
No struggle.
No becoming.

Questioner:
Then what does it mean to live without images?

Teacher:
To live without images is to live without the self — psychologically.
Not the destruction of the body, but the ending of identification.

Such living is not passive.
It is extraordinarily alive.

There is attention without a centre.
Relationship without memory.
Action without motive.

Questioner:
Is such a life opposed to death?

Teacher:
On the contrary.
It is only the image that fears ending.

Where there is no accumulation, there is no fear of death.
Life and death are one movement.

Questioner:
So where does this leave us?

Teacher:
It leaves us with a simple fact:

Where the false ends, the true is.
And where the true is, violence has no place.

Not because it is controlled,
but because the root from which it grows has ended.

***

Where there is an image, there is division.
And where there is division, there is violence.

When the false ends, the true is.
Not as an idea, but as a fact.

*****

When the False Operates, Truth is Not:

- ***Truth is not hidden.***
  It is obscured by the false.

- ***Truth cannot exist in a mind occupied by the false.***

Truth is not something to be protected, preserved, or transmitted.
It does not belong to tradition, belief, memory, or experience.
Truth is not accumulated; it is seen.

The false, on the other hand, is always accumulated.
It is the movement of thought seeking security, continuity, and certainty.
Thought gathers conclusions, beliefs, ideals, images, and calls this gathering knowledge.

Where the false operates, truth cannot be.

Not because truth is fragile, but because the mind occupied by the false has no space to see.

The false does not kill truth violently or deliberately.
It kills by substitution.
It replaces direct perception with ideas, conclusions, and explanations.
The mind then lives with words instead of facts, with symbols instead of reality.

A belief about truth is not truth.
An experience of truth is not truth.
A memory of truth is not truth.

All these are movements of the false.

The mind says, “I have understood,” and carries that understanding forward.
In that very moment, truth is gone.
What remains is only memory repeating itself.

Truth is always new.
It has no continuity.
It cannot be approached through time.

The false thrives in time — in becoming, in improvement, in tomorrow.
Truth is immediate or it is not at all.

This is why methods, systems, and disciplines cannot lead to truth.
They promise gradual arrival.
But truth is not at the end of a path.

The false also disguises itself as virtue.
It calls itself belief, faith, morality, spirituality, non-violence.
But when these are sustained by thought, they remain within the field of the false.

Even the search for truth can be false.
Because search implies a seeker, and the seeker is the product of the past.
The seeker wants certainty, experience, recognition.
And where the seeker is, truth is not.

Truth comes only when the false is completely absent.
Not pushed away, not suppressed, not analysed — but seen.

When the false is seen as false, it ends.
And in that ending, truth is.

Not as something you possess,
not as something you can name,
but as a state of mind free from distortion.

If the false remains, truth is only an idea.
And an idea, however noble, is still false.

So, the real question is not how to find truth,
but whether the mind can be free of the false.

When the false ends, truth does not arrive.
It was never absent.

***

A Dialogue

Questioner:
You say that the false kills the truth. That sounds extreme. Surely truth cannot be destroyed.

Teacher:
Truth cannot be destroyed.
But the mind can be so occupied by the false that truth has no place.

Questioner:
What do you mean by the false?

Teacher:
The false is not merely wrong information.

It is the movement of thought seeking psychological security.

Beliefs, ideals, conclusions, experiences, images — all these are the false when they are taken as truth.

Questioner:
Are you saying belief itself is false?

Teacher:
A belief is thought crystallised.
Thought is always the past.

Truth is not of the past.

So, belief may give comfort, direction, hope — but it is not truth.

Questioner:
But belief in truth is not the same as truth itself.

Teacher:
Exactly.
A belief about truth is not truth.

Nor is an experience of truth truth.
Nor is the memory of a moment of clarity truth.

All these belong to thought.

Questioner:
Then how does the false “kill” the truth?

Teacher:
Not violently.

Not deliberately.

It kills by substitution.

The mind substitutes words for facts, ideas for perception, explanations for seeing.
And then it lives with these substitutes.

Questioner:
So, truth is lost when the mind says, “I have understood”?

Teacher:
Yes.
The moment the mind concludes, it stops seeing.

What it carries forward is not truth, but memory.
And memory repeating itself is the false.

Questioner:
But knowledge is necessary in life.

Teacher:
Knowledge is necessary in its own field — technology, communication, survival.

But psychologically, knowledge becomes an obstacle.
Because the mind then approaches life through what it already knows.

Truth cannot be approached through what is already known.

Questioner:
Is truth something that comes gradually, through time?

Teacher:

The false thrives in time — in becoming, in improvement, in tomorrow.

Truth is immediate, or it is not at all.

A truth discovered tomorrow is already a conclusion today.

Questioner:
What about methods, disciplines, systems? Surely, they help the mind become quiet.

Teacher:
They promise future arrival.
They strengthen the idea of a seeker moving toward a goal.

But the seeker is the product of the past.
And where the seeker is, truth is not.

Questioner:
Are you saying even the search for truth can be false?

Teacher:
Yes.

Search implies lack.
It implies a seeker who wants certainty, experience, achievement.

Truth is not something to be achieved.

Questioner:
Then how does truth come into being?

Teacher:
It does not come into being.

Truth is when the false is absent.

Questioner:
Absent through effort? Through analysis?

Teacher:
No.

Effort is still the false trying to change itself.
Analysis is the past examining the past.

The false ends only when it is seen as false.

Questioner:
Seen how?

Teacher:
As one sees danger.

Not intellectually.
Not philosophically.

When you see that something is false, you do not negotiate with it.

It ends.

Questioner:
And when the false ends, what happens?

Teacher:
Do not ask what happens.

That question is again the false seeking continuity.

When the false ends, truth is.
Not as an experience, not as a possession.

But as a state of mind free from distortion.

Questioner:
So, truth is never absent?

Teacher:
Truth is never absent.
Only the false stands in the way.

Questioner:
Then the real question is not how to find truth?

Teacher:
No.

The real question is whether the mind can be free of the false.

Questioner:
And if the false remains?

Teacher:
Then truth becomes an idea.
And an idea, however noble, is still false.

Questioner:
So, truth cannot coexist with the false?

Teacher:
Where the false operates, truth is not.

That is a fact, not a belief.

Questioner:
And the ending of the false?

Teacher:
Is the beginning of intelligence.

Not gradual.
Not tomorrow.

Now — or never.

***

- ***When the false ends, truth is.***
  Not as an idea, but as a fact.

- ***Truth begins where the false ends.***

- ***An idea about truth is not truth.***

- ***The ending of the false is intelligence.***

*****

The Illusion of Success

- ***"Truth begins where measurement ends."***
- ***"What is false does not need to be resisted—only seen."***
- ***"Success is a word born of comparison; clarity has no opposite."***
- ***"When the mind measures life, it has already moved away from truth."***
- ***"Seeing is not becoming."***

There is really no such thing as success.
Success is a word invented by thought to measure life, to compare one human being with another, to judge oneself as having arrived or failed. Where there is measurement, there is division; and where there is division, there must be conflict.

Life is not a ladder to be climbed.

What matters is not success, but seeing the false as false.

The false is not something abstract. It is the daily movement of the mind that seeks security in accumulation, identity in position, continuity in possession, and worth in recognition. These movements appear normal, even respectable, because society lives by them. But when they are observed without choice or condemnation, their falseness is revealed.

Seeing the false as false is not an achievement. It does not require effort, discipline, or time. The moment one tries to be

successful in seeing, the mind has already moved into becoming, which is another form of illusion.

In the act of seeing, there is an ending.

When the mind sees that psychological accumulation breeds fear, that comparison breeds violence, that ambition is a subtle form of despair, those movements end naturally. They are not resisted or suppressed; they fall away because they are understood.

This understanding brings order—not the order imposed by belief, discipline, or authority, but an order that arises from clarity. This order is not personal. It does not belong to "me." It is the natural harmony that comes when the mind is no longer distorted by false values.

That order is intelligence.

In this intelligence there is no ambition, no pursuit, no idea of success or failure. There is only attention—alert, sensitive, and alive to what is.

Such a mind lives simply, not because it has chosen simplicity, but because complexity born of illusion has ended. It acts without seeking reward and loves without possessing.

This is not success.

It is the right order of life, which comes into being when the false is seen as false—and not a moment later.

***

Questioner:

You say there is no such thing as success. That seems to go against everything society values.

Respondent:
Society values what it has been conditioned to value. The question is not what society values, but whether those values are true.

Questioner:
But without success—without achievement, recognition, or progress—how does one live?

Respondent:
Before asking how to live without success, one must see what success is. Is it not measurement—more than another, better than yesterday, higher than before?

Questioner:
Yes, success implies comparison.

Respondent:
And comparison implies division—this and that, me and you, winner and loser. Where there is division, can there be peace?

Questioner:
No, division always brings conflict.

Respondent:
Then can conflict ever produce order?

Questioner:
It cannot.

Respondent:

So, the very structure of success contains disorder, though it may appear respectable and necessary.

Questioner:
Then what takes the place of success?

Respondent:
Nothing takes its place. The mind that looks for a replacement is still functioning in the field of becoming.

Questioner:
Then what remains?

Respondent:
Seeing the false as false.

Questioner:
What do you mean by "false"?

Respondent:
The false is the belief that accumulation gives security, that position gives dignity, that possession gives continuity, and that becoming gives fulfilment.

Questioner:
Are these beliefs not natural to human beings?

Respondent:
They are habitual, not natural. They arise from fear—from the sense of inner emptiness and insecurity.

Questioner:
How does one see this falseness?

Respondent:

Not through effort or analysis. One sees it in daily life—in relationship, in ambition, in the desire to be somebody.

Questioner:
But the mind immediately judges, condemns, or justifies what it sees.

Respondent:
Then it is not seeing. It is reacting from the past.

Questioner:
So, seeing requires a certain quality of attention?

Respondent:
Attention in which there is no observer separate from what is observed.

Questioner:
Is that possible?

Respondent:
It is possible only when there is no motive to change what is seen. The moment there is motive, attention narrows into effort.

Questioner:
So, seeing the false is not a practice?

Respondent:
Any practice implies time and reward. Truth is not in time.

Questioner:
When the false is seen, what happens to ambition?

Respondent:

Ambition is seen as fear. In that seeing, it has no energy to continue.

Questioner:
And accumulation?

Respondent:
Psychological accumulation is seen as burden. Knowledge has its place, but identity built from memory is a prison.

Questioner:
Does this seeing bring freedom?

Respondent:
Freedom is not something that comes later. The seeing is freedom.

Questioner:
Then is there order in such a life?

Respondent:
Yes, but not the order imposed by discipline, belief, or control.

Questioner:
What kind of order is it then?

Respondent:
The order that naturally comes when distortion ends. When false values no longer shape perception, intelligence operates.

Questioner:
Is this intelligence personal?

Respondent:
It is not “mine” or “yours.” It is not the intelligence of experience or knowledge. It is the intelligence of life itself.

Questioner:
Does such a mind act?

Respondent:
It acts without motive. Therefore, its action is precise and whole.

Questioner:
Then what becomes of success and failure?

Respondent:
They lose their meaning. They belong to a mind that measures itself.

Questioner:
So, life is not to be judged?

Respondent:
Life is to be lived, not evaluated.

Questioner:
Is this not a very demanding way to live?

Respondent:
Only for a mind that clings to illusion. For a mind that sees clearly, it is effortless.

Questioner:
Then in one sentence, what is real order?

Respondent:

Real order is the state in which the false has ended—and therefore truth does not need to be sought.

***

- ***"When the false ends, order is."***
- ***"Truth does not reward; it orders."***
- ***"Order is not achieved—it appears when illusion ceases."***
- ***"There is no success in truth, only the ending of error."***
- ***"To see the false as false is the only revolution."***

*****

Truth is Never in Time

- ***"Time is the movement of thought."***
- ***"Where thought moves, time is."***
- ***"The past seeking continuity is called time."***
- ***"The present cannot be approached through memory."***

Time, as we ordinarily understand it, is the movement of thought. Thought is born of memory; memory is the residue of experience; and experience is always of the past. In this sense, thought can never be new. However refined or subtle it may be, it is always old. And because thought is old, it moves in time. Thought is time.

There is, of course, chronological time. The clock has its place. Without chronological time, we could not meet, speak, build, or function in the world. Yesterday led to today, and today prepares for tomorrow in the practical sense. That time is necessary and sane.

But psychological time is something entirely different.

Psychological time is the movement of the "me" from what it has been, through what it is, toward what it hopes to become. It is the time of regret, fear, hope, ambition, guilt, and promise. It is the time in which the mind says, "I was," "I am," and "I shall be." This psychological time is not factual; it is invented by thought as a means of continuity.

The mind clings to continuity because it is afraid to end.

In psychological time, the past is memory carried forward, the present is interpreted through that memory, and the future is projected desire or fear. But this entire movement is one movement. There is no real past, present, or future psychologically—there is only the ongoing activity of thought maintaining itself.

If one observes very carefully, one sees that the "present" most people live in is not the present at all. It is the past modifying itself and calling that modification "now." The mind never actually meets the present; it only meets its own projections.

So, what is the present?

The present is not a point between past and future. The present is not something to be experienced and stored. The moment one experiences the present; it has already become the past. Therefore, the present is not an experience.

The present is a state in which thought is silent.

When thought is silent—not controlled, not suppressed, not made silent by discipline—there is a completely different quality of being. In that silence, there is no observer separate from what is observed. There is no "me" watching the moment. There is only the movement of life itself.

This movement is alive, fresh, and new—second to second.

It is not continuous. Continuity belongs to thought. Life is discontinuous; it is always now. Each moment is complete in itself and does not carry over into the next. That is why the mind that seeks continuity through memory is always in conflict with life.

In this silent present, there is no accumulation. Nothing is being gathered, recorded, or stored as psychological knowledge. Without accumulation, there is no centre. Without a centre, there is no observer. Without an observer, there is no division.

And where there is no division, there is intelligence.

This intelligence is not personal. It is not the intelligence of experience, learning, or expertise. It is the intelligence that operates when the mind is no longer interfering. It acts instantly, accurately, without hesitation or regret.

Such intelligence does not belong to time.

The mind that understands this does not try to remain in the present—that very effort would again be time. It does not seek silence, because seeking implies becoming. It simply sees the truth of time as thought, and in that seeing, thought finds its right place.

Then chronological time functions, but psychological time ends.

In that ending, there is freedom—not freedom from something, but freedom itself. There is no fear of the future because the future is no longer psychologically projected. There is no burden of the past because memory has lost its authority.

There is only living.

Living not as a continuity, but as a constant dying and renewing. Each moment dies to the next, and therefore each

moment is new. This is not a poetic idea; it is a fact when the mind is silent.

This silent present is not something mystical. It is available whenever the mind sees the falseness of psychological time. And that seeing is immediate. It does not belong to tomorrow.

Truth is always now—or it is not truth

***

Questioner:
You say that time is thought. That sounds abstract. Time seems very real—we grow old, things change, events happen.

Respondent:
We must be careful to distinguish. There is chronological time and there is psychological time. They are not the same.

Questioner:
What do you mean by chronological time?

Respondent:
The time of the clock and the calendar. Yesterday, today, and tomorrow as practical necessities. Without that time, we cannot function in daily life.

Questioner:
And psychological time?

Respondent:
Psychological time is the movement of thought as the "me"—the movement from what one was, through what one is, toward what one hopes to become.

Questioner:
Is that not also natural?

Respondent:
It is habitual, not natural. It is sustained by memory, fear, hope, and desire for continuity.

Questioner:
How is thought related to time?

Respondent:
Thought is born of memory. Memory is of the past. Therefore, thought can only move in the past. That movement we call time.

Questioner:
So, you are saying thought is time?

Respondent:
Psychologically, yes. Thought and time are one movement.

Questioner:
But we experience the present, do we not?

Respondent:
Do we? Or do we experience the past naming itself as the present?

Questioner:
What do you mean?

Respondent:
The moment you say, “I am experiencing the present,” that experience has already been translated into memory. Experience is always of the past.

Questioner:
Then what is the present?

Respondent:
The present is not an experience. It cannot be captured, named, or remembered.

Questioner:
Then is there a present at all?

Respondent:
Yes, but not for thought.

Questioner:
Then how is the present known?

Respondent:
It is not known. It is lived.

Questioner:
What is the quality of that living?

Respondent:
A state in which thought is silent—not made silent, not controlled, but naturally quiet because it has seen its own limitation.

Questioner:
In that silence, is there an observer?

Respondent:
No. The observer is the past. When the past is quiet, the observer ends.

Questioner:
Then what remains?

Respondent:
Only the movement of life itself—alive, fresh, and new from moment to moment.

Questioner:
Is this movement continuous?

Respondent:
No. Continuity belongs to thought. Life is always now. Each moment is complete and ends immediately.

Questioner:
Why does the mind seek continuity then?

Respondent:
Because it is afraid of ending. Continuity gives the illusion of security.

Questioner:
And accumulation?

Respondent:
Accumulation is the attempt to carry the past into the present. It is the very structure of psychological time.

Questioner:
When there is no accumulation, what happens?

Respondent:
There is no centre. Without a centre, there is no division.

Questioner:

Is that order?

Respondent:
Yes—but not the order imposed by discipline or thought. It is the natural order of intelligence.

Questioner:
Is this intelligence personal?

Respondent:
No. It does not belong to the "me." It operates only when the "me" is absent.

Questioner:
Does this mean the future no longer matters?

Respondent:
The future exists only as practical planning. Psychologically, it loses its grip.

Questioner:
So, fear of the future ends?

Respondent:
Fear is sustained by time. When psychological time ends, fear ends.

Questioner:
And the past?

Respondent:
Memory functions where necessary, but it no longer shapes identity.

Questioner:

Then what is living in the present?

Respondent:
It is dying to each moment as it passes—so that each next moment is entirely new.

Questioner:
Is this not a state to be maintained?

Respondent:
Nothing that is alive can be maintained. The moment you try to hold it; it becomes time again.

Questioner:
Then what is the truth of all this?

Respondent:
That truth is never in time. It is only in the seeing of what is—now.

***

- ***"When psychological time ends, life begins."***
- ***"The present is not an experience; it is living."***
- ***"Truth is never in time."***
- ***"Where the observer ends, the present is."***

*****

No God will save Us

No God will save humanity.
No belief, no saviour, no ideology, no system will redeem human beings from the violence, confusion, and sorrow they have created.

To wait for salvation is already to deny responsibility.

Humanity has always looked outward—to gods, prophets, leaders, sciences, and now technologies—hoping that something outside will correct what is inwardly disordered. But the disorder of the world is the disorder of the human mind. And no external agency can transform that.

What alone can bring order is intelligence—not the intelligence of thought, calculation, or accumulation of knowledge, but the intelligence that operates when thought is silent.

Thought is useful in its right place. It builds bridges, performs surgery, stores memory. But psychologically, thought creates the self—an image made of memory, experience, fear, pleasure, and identification. That self is the centre of conflict. From it arise division, nationalism, belief, ambition, comparison, and violence.

As long as this self dominates, compassion is impossible.

Compassion is not cultivated. It is not learned. It is not practised through discipline or morality. Compassion reveals itself naturally when the self is absent—when there is no centre seeking security, advantage, or continuity.

This is why no God can save humanity.

Any God conceived by thought is already part of the problem. Such a God becomes another refuge, another authority, another consolation. Belief then replaces understanding, and obedience replaces intelligence.

Krishnamurti pointed out again and again that truth is a pathless land. You cannot approach it through belief, ritual, or tradition. You come upon it only when the mind is utterly quiet—when it is no longer becoming something, no longer seeking safety in ideas.

When the self ends, intelligence acts.

That intelligence is not personal. It does not belong to "me" or "you." It is not yours to possess or mine to transmit. It functions only when the mind is free of its own noise.

And where intelligence acts, compassion is.

Not compassion as pity, not charity as duty, but a sensitivity to all life that does not divide. Such compassion has its own order. It does not argue, persuade, or convert. It acts because it sees.

Whether humanity will survive or perish does not depend on gods, prayers, or hopes for the future. It depends on whether human beings are willing to see the movement of the self in themselves and let it end.

This ending is not gradual. It does not belong to time. It happens in the instant of seeing.

And in that seeing, intelligence and compassion are one.

That is the only saving.

*****

Is the Problem the Fact or the Mind?

You have problems—everyone does.
There is no life without challenge, without disturbance, without the unexpected.
But the real suffering begins when the mind carries these problems,
when it broods over them, repeats them,
makes them part of its identity.

A problem is a fact.
What the mind adds to the fact—fear, worry, resistance,
the endless movement of thought—
is what turns a simple fact into a burden.

Can you meet a problem when it arises,
look at it directly, clearly, without the shadow of yesterday?
Then the problem is dealt with.
It does not become psychological residue.
It does not corrupt the mind.

The issue is not the problem itself,
but the mind that clings to it,
carries it,
projects it into the future,
and makes it bigger than it is.

To live is to face problems.
But to carry them is to live in conflict.

When the mind sees a problem as it is and ends it,
the mind remains fresh, unscarred, unburdened.
Only such a mind can meet life wholly

***

On Problems and the Burden of the Mind

Questioner:
You say there is no life without problems. But then how is one to live without suffering?

Teacher:
Sir, first see the fact: life brings problems as it brings sunlight and shadow. That is inevitable. What is not inevitable is the mind carrying those problems.

Questioner:
But a problem does not end when the event ends. The consequences remain.

Teacher:
The consequences are facts. But the mind does something more—it repeats, worries, resists, imagines outcomes. That repetition is not the problem; it is the burden thought creates.

Questioner:
Are you saying one should ignore problems?

Teacher:
On the contrary. One must meet a problem completely, with full attention. But meeting is not the same as holding on. When you hold on, you are no longer dealing with the fact—you are living in memory.

Questioner:
So, what does it mean not to carry a problem?

Teacher:
To end it where it arises. To look at it without fear, without escape, without the past interfering. When attention is complete, the problem finishes. Only incomplete attention leaves residue.

Questioner:
But some problems seem to return again and again.

Teacher:
Because they were never ended. They were postponed, analysed, or suppressed. Thought turned them into continuity. What ends a problem is not time, but perception.

Questioner:
Then suffering comes from the mind, not from the problem?

Teacher:
Yes. The fact may be painful, but suffering is the mind's refusal to let the fact end. It carries the problem as memory and calls it life.

Questioner:
Is it possible to live without this accumulation?

Teacher:
Only when the mind learns to meet each challenge anew, without carrying yesterday into today. Such a mind is light, fresh, and therefore capable of dealing with life as it is.

Questioner:
So, the art is not to avoid problems, but to remain free of them inwardly?

Teacher:
Exactly. Problems are part of living. But a mind that carries problems is already defeated.

*****

Beyond Goals

When one sees factually, not intellectually or ideologically, that every goal, every ideal, every principle inevitably divides human beings, that very seeing ends the attachment to goals. This is not an act of renunciation, nor a moral decision; it is the ending of something false because it has been seen as false. Just as one drops a poisonous substance when one understands its danger, so the mind drops the ideal.

But then a deeper question arises, and it is this question that truly matters:

If there is no goal, how is one to act, to work, to live with another?

We have been trained to function through becoming—I am this, I should be that. All cooperation, all effort, all organization has been based on movement toward a future image: a better society, a perfected human being, a utopia promised tomorrow. And because each group imagines a different tomorrow, conflict is born. The ideal becomes more important than the human being standing before us.

When the goal ends, the old structure collapses. And the mind, frightened by this emptiness, immediately asks for a new pattern: Without a goal, how can we function? How can we work together?

This question itself reveals how deeply conditioned we are.

To work with a goal is to work under pressure—pressure of achievement, comparison, success, failure. It breeds authority and obedience, leaders and followers. But to work without a goal is to stand in a completely different space.

Working without a goal does not mean drifting, laziness, or chaos. That is a misunderstanding born of conditioning. It means that action arises from seeing what is, not from pursuing what should be.

If I see a child suffering, I do not need an ideal of a perfect world to act. The perception of suffering is the action. If I see disorder in myself, the very observation of that disorder brings its own order—without blueprint, without discipline imposed from outside.

So, the question is not, how shall I work without a goal?
The real question is: Can we meet each other without the interference of images?

When two human beings meet without ideals, without conclusions, without the authority of principles, there is listening. In that listening, intelligence operates—not personal intelligence, not cleverness, but an intelligence that is common to all humanity.

Then work is no longer "my work" and "your work."
There is only the doing of what is necessary now.

Such work has no ambition in it.
It has no psychological future.
It is not divided into success and failure.

This demands great attention. And attention is not a goal; it is a state of being.

When attention is present, cooperation happens naturally. There is no need to organize it through beliefs or ideals. Just as the organs of the body function together without a theory of unity, human beings can work together when there is no psychological division created by becoming something.

So, the ending of the goal is not the end of action.

It is the beginning of right action.

And right action is never born of a plan.
It is born of seeing—seeing the fact, the relationship, the moment—as it is.

That seeing is love.
And love does not divide.

*****

Only seeing

Sir, look what we have made of life.
We have divided ourselves into tribes, into communities, into nations, into ideologies.
Each division carries its own flag, its own anthem, its own wounds, its own fears.

And we accept all this as natural.
We never question it fundamentally.
We polish the walls that separate us and call it culture, tradition, patriotism, pride.
But the moment you see the fact—not the idea, not the opinion, but the fact—you realize the utter absurdity of it all.

Nationalism, tribalism, communalism, internationalism—they are all fragments created by thought.
Thought has broken the world into pieces and then asks why there is conflict.
It creates the problem and then seeks the solution.
It is like a man who wounds himself and then begs for a remedy.

To see the absurdity of division is to step out of it.
Not through effort, not through discipline, not through the cultivation of a new belief, but simply through seeing.
When you see poison for what it is, you do not argue—you drop it instantly.

In the same way, when you see that all division is born of fear and ignorance, it ends.
You jump out of it naturally, as you jump away from a snake.
That "something else" you jump into is not a new ideology, not a broader nationalism, not a nobler identification.
It is a state where the mind is free from the burden of belonging to anything—free from the need to be rooted in a tribe, religion, nation, or idea.

It is freedom itself.

Now, take that same quality of seeing and turn it inward.

You feel loneliness.
You recognize it through words, through memories, through associations:
"I am lonely because I am not loved… because I am isolated… because I have no relationship."
The moment you name it, you have already escaped from it.
Recognition is the escape; naming is the escape.

But can you look at loneliness without the word, without the images it has created over the years?
Can you look at it as you would look at a new flower, a new sky—fresh, untouched, unnamed?

When you look without association, without the movement of thought, something extraordinary happens:
the thing you are looking at unfolds, flowers, and ends.
Because the observer—the one who resists or seeks to change loneliness—is not separate from loneliness.
The observer is loneliness.

And when you see that profoundly, totally, without a shadow of escape,
the whole content of loneliness dissolves.

There is no battle, no suppression, no analysis, no gradual progress.
It ends because the one who carried it is no longer interfering.

So, sir, the real work is not to struggle with loneliness or with the divisions of society,
but to see, to watch, to observe without the distortion of thought.
In that observation, the work is finished.
You have stepped into a different quality of mind—

a mind that does not belong to any group,
that does not run away from its own emptiness,
that stands completely alone and therefore completely free.

And in that freedom
there is love.

***

Sir, when you look at humanity from the height of the stars,
all our divisions—tribes, nations, religions, ideologies—
are like scratches on the surface of a small, fragile planet.

From the cosmic silence,
there is no Hindu or Muslim,
no American or Chinese,
no tribe, no community,
no "us" and "them."
There is only one movement of life,
one breath flowing through billions of forms.

But thought, which is small and frightened,
carves the earth into fragments
and then worships the fragments it has created.
It raises flags on a planet that spins alone in infinite darkness,
as though the universe recognizes our symbols.
It declares sacred the divisions that are born of fear.
It builds boundaries on a speck of dust
floating in an immeasurable immensity.

When you see this—not as an idea,
but with the clarity of a mind that steps outside its own noise—
the whole structure of division becomes absurd.
Absurd because no star belongs to a nation,
no galaxy waves a flag,
no cosmic law supports our tribal identifications.
They exist only in the narrow corridors of the human mind.

And when you see their absurdity clearly,
completely, instantly,
you step out of them—
as naturally as a bird leaves a branch
when the storm comes.

This stepping out is not a movement toward another ideology.
It is not internationalism or universalism;
those too are woven from the threads of thought.
It is the dropping of the entire fabric,
the ending of the mind's need to belong to any fragment.
In that ending,
there is a silence that is not of the earth.
A silence in which you feel the vastness of existence
touching the depths of your being.

And now, with that same cosmic sensitivity,
look at loneliness.

Loneliness is also a fragment created by thought.
A shadow cast by the mind that compares, remembers, seeks continuity.
Thought recognizes loneliness,
names it,
gives it roots in the past,
projects it into the future.
The moment you name it,
you re-enter the smallness of the human cage.

But can you look at loneliness
as though you were looking at a distant nebula—
without naming, without measuring, without interpreting?
Can you watch it the way the night sky watches itself,
without a centre,
without a witness separate from what is seen?

Then loneliness becomes something vast,

a movement of energy without the watcher.
And in the space where the watcher is not,
the thing watched loses its solidity.
Loneliness unfolds like a cloud dissolving in sunlight,
because the one who resisted it
is no longer there.

In that dissolution
there is a strange freedom—
a freedom not born of escape
but of total insight.
A freedom in which the mind stands alone,
not isolated,
but alone like a star is alone—
complete in itself,
yet part of a boundless wholeness.

To look at oneself without the word
is to touch the infinite.
To end loneliness without effort
is to stand in the very heart of creation.

There,
in that immensity,
the work is finished.

And in that finishing,
the universe breathes through you.

*****

When Respectability Ends, Morality Begins

To be moral, in the profound sense that Jiddu Krishnamurti pointed to, is not to conform, not to be respectable, not to fit neatly into the patterns that society rewards and applauds.

Society calls a man moral when he is ambitious in the "right" way, when his greed is organised as success, when his envy is masked as competition, when his violence is legal, uniformed, or ideological. It honours those who climb, dominate, conquer, accumulate, and defend their tribe, nation, belief, or image. Such a man is respectable—well placed in the social order, praised, protected, and promoted.

But Krishnamurti asks us to look much deeper.

He would say: what is the root of all this respectability?
It is fear—fear of being nothing, fear of not belonging, fear of insecurity. From this fear arises ambition; from ambition, comparison; from comparison, envy and jealousy; from envy, conflict; and from conflict, violence in countless subtle and brutal forms. Society may polish these movements, give them noble names, wrap them in flags, laws, and traditions—but inwardly they remain the same poison.

Therefore, to be truly moral is to end this whole structure inwardly.

It is to see that ambition is not noble but corrupting; that competition is not healthy but divisive; that greed, however refined, breeds inequality and sorrow; that violence is not only war and murder, but also the psychological violence of domination, conformity, imitation, and suppression of another or oneself. A mind that seeks success is already

violent, because success exists only in comparison—and comparison is the denial of love.

Krishnamurti would insist that morality has nothing to do with society's approval. The moment you seek to be respected, you are already immoral, because respectability demands adjustment to a sick structure. A deeply moral person may appear irresponsible, even dangerous, to society—because such a person no longer worships its gods: success, power, authority, tradition.

True morality is born only when the mind is free from fear and desire. Not disciplined into goodness, not controlled into virtue, but free. From that freedom comes intelligence, and from intelligence comes action that is naturally right—not according to books, leaders, or ideals, but according to the living fact of each moment.

Such morality is quiet, simple, and inwardly revolutionary.
It does not kill, exploit, compare, or compete.
It does not seek recognition or reward.
It does not belong to any nation, religion, or ideology.

And precisely because of this, society cannot make it respectable.

To be moral, then, is to stand alone—not in isolation, but in clarity.
It is to end the false order of society within oneself.
And in that ending, a totally different order—rooted in compassion, sensitivity, and intelligence—comes into being.

This, Krishnamurti would say, is the only morality that can transform the world, because it transforms the mind that created the world as it is.

***

The End of Respectability

Questioner:
You say that to be moral is to end all respectability. That sounds shocking. Surely society needs morality, rules, and respectability to function?

Teacher:
We must be very careful with words. What does society mean by morality? And what do you mean by respectability? If we do not examine these words closely, we shall merely repeat what has been accepted for centuries.

Questioner:
By respectability I mean being regarded as good, upright, successful, law-abiding—someone society approves of.

Teacher:
Yes. And what is society? Society is you and me, our ambitions, fears, greed, violence, organised and given continuity. Society is not something separate from us. When society approves of something, it is approving its own image.

Now look at what society rewards. It rewards success, achievement, power. It respects the man who rises above others, who accumulates wealth, who conquers—whether in business, politics, religion, or even spirituality. Is that not so?

Questioner:
Yes, that is true. But are these not necessary to survive?

Teacher:
Survive physically, perhaps. But we are not talking merely of physical survival. We are talking of a good mind, a moral mind. The question is: does ambition create goodness, or does it create conflict?

Questioner:

Ambition does create conflict, but without ambition nothing would be done.

Teacher:
Is that so? Or have we been conditioned to believe that only through pressure, competition, and comparison can anything be accomplished?

Look closely: ambition implies comparison—I must be more than you, better than you. Where there is comparison, there is envy; where there is envy, there is fear; where there is fear, there is aggression. Society may call this progress, but inwardly it is violence.

Questioner:
But society calls such people moral and respectable.

Teacher:
Exactly. That is the crux of the problem. Society considers ambition, competition, greed, envy—when they are successful—as respectable. Violence, when organised as war or defence of ideology, is called noble. Killing, when sanctioned by the state or belief, becomes honourable.

So, society's morality is not morality at all; it is merely organised self-interest.

Questioner:
Then what is true morality?

Teacher:
First see what it is not. It is not conformity. It is not obedience to tradition. It is not the cultivation of virtue according to a pattern. A mind that is respectable is a mind that is frightened—frightened to step out of line, frightened to be nothing.

Respectability is born of fear.

Questioner:
Are you saying that a respectable man is immoral?

Teacher:
I am saying that respectability and morality cannot coexist. The respectable mind seeks security—in position, belief, status, image. To maintain that security, it must compete, imitate, suppress, and sometimes destroy. Such a mind may appear gentle outwardly, but inwardly it is violent.

Questioner:
This sounds very radical. Does it mean one should reject society completely?

Teacher:
Not reject outwardly. Rejection is still reaction. What matters is inward freedom. To see the falseness of society's morality and therefore not be inwardly shaped by it.

When you see a poisonous snake, you do not argue with it or slowly renounce it—you step away instantly. In the same way, when the mind sees that ambition, greed, and envy are destructive, they drop away naturally. Not through effort, but through understanding.

Questioner:
But without rules, without ideals, how will one know what is right?

Teacher:
That question arises only when intelligence is absent. Ideals exist because we do not understand what we are. We invent what we should be to escape what we are. But the moment you introduce an ideal, you have created conflict between what is and what should be.

Morality is not born of ideals. It is born of attention.

Questioner:
Attention to what?

Teacher:
Attention to the whole movement of the self—your thoughts, desires, fears, reactions. When you watch yourself without condemnation or justification, the mind becomes extraordinarily sensitive. In that sensitivity there is intelligence, and intelligence acts rightly.

That action is moral—not because society approves of it, but because it does not breed sorrow.

Questioner:
So, morality is something living, not fixed?

Teacher:
Yes. Morality is not a code. It is not yesterday's conclusion carried over to today. It is a living movement that exists only in the present. The moment morality becomes tradition, it is dead.

Questioner:
Then a truly moral person may appear immoral to society?

Teacher:
Inevitably. Because such a person does not belong to the structure of greed, fear, and authority. He may live quietly, simply, without ambition. Society will call him irresponsible, unproductive, or even dangerous—because he does not worship its gods.

Questioner:
And what is the essence of this morality?

Teacher:

The ending of the self as a centre seeking advantage. When the "me" with its ambitions, fears, and images comes to an end, there is compassion. Not cultivated compassion, but natural compassion.

That compassion will never kill.
It will never exploit.
It will never compete.

Such a mind is moral because it does no harm.

Questioner:
So, to be moral is to stand alone?

Teacher:
To stand alone psychologically—not as an ideal, but as a fact. Alone because you are no longer supported by belief, authority, or social approval. But in that aloneness, there is great love, because love is not of society, not of respectability.

Only such love can bring order to life.

And that order has nothing whatsoever to do with the morality that society proclaims and rewards.

*****

Facts break conditioning

What Krishnamurti Means by “Facts break conditioning

Krishnamurti uses the word fact in a very precise and powerful way.
A fact is what is actually happening right now in consciousness, without interpretation, without distortion, without escape.

A fact is:

- “I am angry.”
- “I am afraid.”
- “I am lonely.”
- “I seek security in ideas.”
- “I compare myself constantly.”

Not the explanation of it,
not the justification,
not the story behind it—
but the raw, direct actuality.

Now, what does conditioning do?

Conditioning is the entire network of:

- past experiences
- beliefs
- fears
- tradition
- religious images
- social pressures
- personal conclusions

This conditioning distorts the fact.

For example:

Fact: “I am afraid.”
Conditioning: “I should not be afraid… I must fight it… how do I overcome it… what caused it?”

The conditioned mind never stays with the fact.

It immediately escapes into explanation, argument, suppression, analysis.

JK’s core insight

When the mind sees a fact without distortion, contradiction ends.

And where contradiction ends, conditioning begins to dissolve.

Why?

Because conditioning operates only through resistance to what is.

If you remain with a fact without running away,
without naming it,
without trying to transform it,
without bringing in the past—

conditioning has no fuel.

- It cannot function.
- It cannot project.
- It cannot distort.
- It cannot continue its momentum.

In that very seeing, conditioning loses its grip.

JK would put it this way:

“The fact is the ending of the false.”

Insight into the fact is itself freedom—
not freedom later, not freedom tomorrow,
but freedom immediately, in the very act of perceiving.

For Krishnamurti, the fact is like fire:

- When you see the fact of fear, the truth of it burns the illusions around it.
- When you see the fact of comparison, the entire structure of becoming begins to crumble.
- When you see the fact of loneliness, the movement of escape stops.

There is no practice, no method, no gradual process.

Seeing the fact completely is the ending of conditioning at that point.

Why “fact” has such power

Because a fact does not come from memory,
from belief,
from tradition,
from authority.

A fact has no ideology attached to it.

A fact is like a light shining on the mind.
Where there is light, darkness cannot remain.

So, Krishnamurti says:

“The seeing of the fact is the ending of the fact.”

“Only perception frees; not effort.”

***

A Neuroscientific Explanation of Krishnamurti’s Statement: “Facts Break Conditioning.”

In neuroscience, human conditioning corresponds to engraved neural pathways—habit loops of emotion, belief, fear, and reaction.
These patterns are stored mainly in:

- the amygdala (fear and threat responses),
- the hippocampus (memory and associative learning),
- and cortical networks related to the Default Mode Network (DMN) (self-referential thinking).

Conditioning persists because the brain automatically interprets present experiences through past patterns.
This is the basis of psychological repetition.

Krishnamurti’s insight is that direct perception of a fact interrupts this automatic circuitry.

Let us see how this works scientifically.

A “Fact” Is Pure Sensory-Cognitive Contact Without Interpretation

A fact, in Krishnamurti’s language, is the raw perception of what is, before the brain overlays it with memory, labels, or stories.

Neuroscience calls this bottom-up perception, processed through sensory cortices without premature activation of the DMN.

Example:

Fact:
“I feel fear right now.”

Conditioning:
“This fear means I’m weak… How do I get rid of it… I always have this problem… I must control it…”

The conditioned reaction activates:

- the amygdala (emotional tagging),
- the prefrontal cortex (problem-solving),
- the DMN (self-based narratives),
- the insula (bodily memory of past emotions).

A “fact” halts this chain by keeping the brain in direct contact with the present sensation, before memory has time to distort.

When the Brain Sees the Fact Without Escape, the DMN Quietens

Neuroscientific research shows:

When a person observes their inner state without judgment or narrative,
the brain’s Default Mode Network—responsible for:

- self-stories,
- past–future thinking,
- autobiographical memory—

deactivates significantly.

This deactivation is measurable through fMRI and EEG.
It corresponds to what Krishnamurti calls:

"The ending of the observer."

When the DMN quiets, the psychological "self" that perpetuates conditioning momentarily dissolves.

In this state, the brain cannot sustain old patterns.
They lose their neural reinforcement.

The Amygdala's Response Weakens When Attention Stays with the Actual Sensation

If you see fear as a pure sensation—not as an idea—
the amygdala's reactivity drops.
This is known as extinction learning, but JK's insight goes further:

He is saying that the very act of direct perception changes the limbic response.

Because:

- When you don't resist fear,
- When you don't escape it,
- When you don't label it,

the amygdala receives no "danger confirmation" signal from the cortex.

This interrupts the feedback loop that normally strengthens conditioning.

Thus, the fact ("there is fear")
breaks the conditioning ("fear must be avoided / suppressed / fought").

A New Neural Pattern Emerges When You Remain with the Fact

Neuroscientists refer to this as neural reconsolidation:

When a memory or conditioned reaction is seen clearly and not acted upon,
it becomes labile, open to modification.
It can reorganize.

Krishnamurti anticipated this by saying:

"Seeing the fact completely is the ending of the fact."

Meaning:
the old pathway is not reinforced;
a new pattern—one of direct perception—begins to form.

This is a biological transformation, not a psychological philosophy.

The Brain Enters a State of Integration and Coherence

When conditioning is not triggered:

- the prefrontal cortex (clarity, insight),
- the insula (present-moment bodily awareness),
- and the anterior cingulate cortex (conflict monitoring)

begin to fire in synchrony.

The brain becomes more integrated.

This integrated state is often described as:

- insight,
- choiceless awareness,
- nonreactive perception,
- wholeness.

Krishnamurti calls it:

"A mind that sees what is."

This state biologically prevents old conditioning from reasserting itself.

Why "Facts" Have the Power to Break Conditioning

Because to perceive a fact without distortion:

- silences the DMN,
- reduces amygdala activation,
- prevents memory-based interpretation,
- stops reinforcement of old neural pathways,
- and enables neural reconsolidation.

A "fact" is like a clean signal entering the brain before the old circuitry can hijack it.

That moment of pure seeing interrupts decades of conditioning.

This is not mysticism.
It is cognitive neuroscience.

In summary (neuroscience + JK)

- Conditioning = memory + self-referential circuitry + emotional tagging
- Fact = perception without narrative
- Fact reduces DMN activity
- Reduced DMN weakens the self-structure
- Amygdala calms because fear is not resisted
- Old neural patterns do not get reinforced
- The brain reorganizes into a coherent, integrated state
- Insight arises
- Conditioning dissolves

Krishnamurti's statement is scientifically precise:

"The fact, seen completely, ends the conditioning."

Because the brain cannot maintain a conditioned reaction in the presence of full, undivided attention.

*****

Is there an action that is not limited?

Sir, all our actions, if you observe very closely, are born out of a centre—
the centre of the "me,"
the centre of memory,
the centre of fear,
the centre of desire,
the centre that wants, protects, resists, achieves.

From that centre, action is always limited.

It may be clever, efficient, moral, successful—
but it is still limited because the centre itself is limited.
Thought, which forms this centre, is fragmentary;
therefore, any action born of thought must also be fragmentary.

Limited action always carries its shadow—conflict.

You may act generously today and violently tomorrow.
You may help in one place and destroy in another.
You may love one person and be indifferent to another.
This is the movement of a mind acting from conditioning.

So, the question is not, "What is unlimited action?"

But, "Can action be free of the centre?"

Krishnamurti would say:

"Where the observer is, action is limited."

“Where the observer is not, action is whole.”

As long as the “me” is involved—
the “me” that wants recognition,
the “me” that seeks security,
the “me” that fears being wrong—
action will always be shaped by the past.

And the past is always limited.

What then is action without limitation?

It is action that does not originate in the past.
Action that is not motivated by reward or punishment.
Action that is not calculated.
Action that is not driven by becoming something.

It is action that springs from pure perception.

When you see what is without distortion,
without conclusions,
without the machinery of thought interfering,
the very seeing becomes the action.

This is extraordinarily important.

In such perception,
there is no gap between seeing and doing.
No hesitation,
no conflict,
no duality between idea and action.

Krishnamurti often said:

“In the interval between seeing and acting lies conflict.”

And where there is conflict,
there is limitation.

Unlimited action is action born of intelligence, not thought.

Intelligence here is not cleverness,
nor academic knowledge,
nor accumulated experience.

It is the clarity that comes
when the mind sees the truth of something instantly.

When you see danger—
a snake, a precipice—
you act without thought.

That action is whole, instantaneous, complete.

Similarly:

- When you see the truth of comparison, comparison drops.
- When you see the truth of violence, violence ends.
- When you see the truth of fear, fear dissolves.

The seeing is the action.

This is action free from limitation
because it does not arise from the self.

Action Without the Actor

In limited action, the “actor”—the “me”—is always at the centre.

In unlimited action, there is action without the actor.

The mind acts not from memory but from attention.
It moves the way a tree responds to sunlight,
the way a bird adjusts its wings to the wind—
not through deliberation,
but through direct, non-fragmented intelligence.

Such action has no opposite,
no regret,
no continuation as memory seeking reward.
It is complete in the moment.

So, what is action that is not limited?

It is action in which the self is absent.

When the mind is quiet—
not disciplined, not forced,
but naturally quiet because it sees the futility of noise—
then there is a depth of attention in which
action arises effortlessly, like a flower opening.

That action is:

- whole,
- complete,
- without motive,
- without residue,
- without conflict.

It is the only true freedom in life.

***

A Neuroscientific Explanation of Unlimited Action

Aligned with J. Krishnamurti's Teaching

In neuroscience, most human action arises from predictive processing—the brain's tendency to respond based on prior experience, memory, fear, reward, and conditioning.
This creates limited action because:

1. It is driven by the past.
2. It activates habitual neural circuits.
3. It reinforces the sense of a separate "self" making the decision.

Krishnamurti calls such action fragmented, conditioned, and therefore limited.

So, what would "unlimited action" look like in the brain?

Let us examine this scientifically.

The Neuroscience of Limited Action

When you act from:

- fear,
- desire,
- comparison,
- belief,
- memory,
- ego,
- social conditioning,

the brain relies on top-down processing—
the prefrontal cortex and Default Mode Network (DMN) impose past templates on the present situation.

Neural signatures of limited action:

- High DMN activation (self-referential thinking)
- Amygdala involvement (fear, threat bias)
- Reinforcement of old neural pathways
- Cortical prediction overriding actual perception
- Delay between perception and action

Krishnamurti refers to this as action arising from the observer—the centre, the "me."

Such action is inherently limited because it is the repetition of stored patterns.

Unlimited Action = Action Without the Interference of the Self

Krishnamurti describes a state where perception is instantaneous, and action flows directly from that perception without the movement of thought.

Neuroscience has a parallel concept:

"Perception-action coupling without top-down interference."

This happens when:

- The DMN quiets (reduction in self-referential activity)
- The prefrontal cortex does not impose past models
- The brain operates in a state of integrated coherence
- The sensory cortices and motor regions communicate directly

In this state, action emerges from direct contact with reality, not from conditioned patterns.

This is what Krishnamurti calls action without the actor.

The Brain in a State of Insight

During moments of deep insight, neuroscience shows:

- Sudden synchronization across distant brain regions
- Gamma-wave bursts (30–90 Hz) associated with integration
- Deactivation of the DMN
- Minimal activity in fear and reward circuits
- A collapse of habitual prediction systems

This is not gradual; it is instantaneous—
reflecting JK's description:

"The seeing is the doing."

In insight, the brain does not consult the past.
It acts from the totality of perception in that moment.

Such action cannot be limited because it is not the product of conditioning.

Unlimited Action as a Biological State of Wholeness

When the self is inactive, the brain enters a state neuroscientists call:

Global Neural Integration

or

Whole-brain coherence

Characteristics:

- No conflict between emotional, cognitive, and sensory networks
- High flexibility, low rigidity
- Absence of internal contradiction
- Immediate response to present demands
- No residue of psychological conflict

This matches Krishnamurti's statement:

"In attention there is no centre; therefore, action is whole."

When action is whole, it is not divided by the past, and therefore it is not limited.

Why Unlimited Action Is "Unlimited"

From a neuroscience perspective, such action is unlimited because:

A. It is not constrained by previous neural patterns.

The brain is not using old templates to interpret the present.

B. It is not motivated by reward or avoidance.

The dopaminergic circuits are quiet.

C. It is not distorted by fear or desire.

Amygdala circuits disengage.

D. It is not divided between competing brain networks.

The brain operates as a unified system.

E. It is free from psychological time.

The brain is not projecting a future or referencing a past.

This is a unique neurocognitive state—
a state of pure, undivided responsiveness.

Unlimited Action Is a Neural State, not a Philosophy

Krishnamurti's insight is biologically grounded:

When the self-referential system (DMN) is quiet,

the brain acts without conflict, without fragmentation,
and therefore, without limitation.

Unlimited action is not mystical.

It is the brain functioning without interference from conditioned patterns,
responding directly, wholly, and intelligently to the present situation.

This aligns perfectly with JK's statement:

"When the mind is completely attentive, action is total."

*****

A Place of No Registration

Krishnamurti used the word “registration” in a very specific psychological sense.
To register is to record, store, retain, carry over an experience as memory—
whether pleasant or painful.

The human mind is continually registering:

- insults and flattery
- hurts and pleasures
- images of success and failure
- patterns of fear and desire
- wounds from childhood
- ambitions for tomorrow

This continuous recording creates the centre of the self—
the “me” that gathers experiences and defends them.

Krishnamurti asks:

“Is there a place in the mind where there is no registration at all?”

This does not mean amnesia.
It does not mean the brain stops storing factual information—
like your name, how to drive a car, or how to perform surgery.

He is referring to psychological registration,
the recording of pleasure, pain, praise, insult, fear,
which builds the psychological structure of the self.

What happens when psychological registration stops?

There is a quality of mind that meets each moment fully, responds completely,
and does not carry anything over to the next moment.

This is a mind without residue.

A mind that does not accumulate psychological impressions is extraordinarily alive, fresh, clear.

As Krishnamurti would say:

“Where there is registration, there is continuation of the self.”

“Where there is no registration, there is freedom.”

Why does the mind register psychologically?

Because the self needs continuity.
It needs stories.
It needs protection.
It needs to feel important.

So, the mind:

- clings to pleasure
- resists pain
- remembers hurt
- seeks comfort in images
- stores every emotional shock

This constant recording creates psychological time—
the movement from “what was” to “what should be.”

Where there is time, there is fear.

Where there is fear, there is conflict.

A place of no registration is the ending of psychological time.

It is not the ending of memory.
It is the ending of the psychological momentum
that fuels sorrow, fear, comparison, jealousy, ambition.

It is a state where the mind is so attentive,
so fully awake,
that it has no need to store psychological experience.

Because attention finishes the experience completely.

Only incomplete experiences register.
Only half-seen hurts fester.
Only pleasures chased tomorrow register as desire.

Krishnamurti says:

“When you see the fact entirely, there is no registration.”

The beauty of a mind with no registration

A mind that does not register psychologically is:

- sensitive without being wounded
- aware without being burdened
- loving without possessing
- responding without reacting
- alive without carrying yesterday

It is like a clear mirror—
reflecting everything, retaining nothing.

It is like the sky—
clouds pass, storms pass, sunlight passes,
but the sky is never scarred.

Why is such a mind possible?

Because psychological registration is not inevitable.
It happens only when the mind is inattentive.

When you are completely attentive,
the experience is completely met,
and therefore, completely ended.

Attention is like flame—
it burns the residue.

In that flame,
there is a place in the mind
where nothing of the self gathers.

A place of no shadow.

A place of no past.

A place of immense silence.

A place that is untouched by hurt
and untouched by pleasure.

A place where love is possible.

***

A Neuroscientific Explanation of "A Place of No Registration

In Krishnamurti's Sense

Krishnamurti used registration to refer to the psychological recording of experience—
the emotional tagging of events with hurt, pleasure, fear, and memory.
Modern neuroscience has a clear framework to understand this.

Let's examine the brain mechanisms involved.

What is "Registration" in Neuroscience?

Psychological registration corresponds to two key processes:

A. Emotional tagging

Done by the amygdala, which marks an experience as:

- pleasant
- threatening
- painful
- rewarding

B. Memory consolidation

Performed by the hippocampus, which stores the emotional experience into long-term memory.

Together, these processes create:

- grudges
- psychological scars
- attachments
- desires
- fears

- personal identity narratives

This is the neurobiological basis of conditioning.

What Would "No Registration" Mean in the Brain?

Krishnamurti is not suggesting the brain stop storing factual memory.
He is pointing to ending the emotional imprinting that builds the psychological self.

Neuroscientifically, "no psychological registration" corresponds to:

A. Reduced amygdala activation

The emotional centre does not tag the experience as pleasure or pain.

B. No transfer to autobiographical memory

The hippocampus does not integrate the event into the personal narrative.

C. Silence in the Default Mode Network (DMN)

The brain network responsible for:

- "me" stories
- self-image
- rumination
- past-future projections

becomes quiet.

This is a known state in neuroscience

seen during:

- deep insight,
- pure attentional states,
- choiceless awareness,
- trauma resolution,
- advanced meditative states.

In such states, experiences are fully perceived, but not stored as psychological residues.

Attentional States That Prevent Registration

Research shows:

When the brain is in full attentional presence,
a specific neural pattern emerges:

A. High activation in the dorsal attention network (DAN)

= precise focus, moment-to-moment awareness

B. Deactivation of the DMN

= no self-referential interpretation (“This happened to me”)

C. Inhibition of emotional tagging

= amygdala stays quiet, reducing fear or pleasure reinforcement

D. No memory consolidation of emotional content

= hippocampus does not encode the moment as psychological memory

This is exactly what Krishnamurti means:

“When you observe without the observer, there is no registration.”

The brain perceives reality directly but does not carry it as psychological baggage.

How Attention Erases Registration

Modern studies show that complete attention interferes with the brain’s habit of storing emotional experiences.

Mechanism:

- When you fully attend to something (fear, insult, pain), the salience of the experience is processed in real-time.
- Because there is no resistance, no avoidance, no narrative, the amygdala does not amplify the emotional signal.

Thus:

❌ No emotional tagging →

❌ No long-term psychological memory →

✓ Psychological experience ends with the moment.

This corresponds to Krishnamurti’s statement:

“Attention ends the experience; therefore, there is no recording.”

A Place of No Registration = A Brain Without Psychological Time

Neuroscience confirms:

- When the DMN is quiet,
- When the amygdala is inactive,
- When memory systems are not encoding emotional residue,

the brain no longer constructs:

- a past to hold onto
- a future to fear
- an identity to defend

This matches JK's insight:

"Where there is no registration, there is no psychological yesterday or tomorrow."

The brain exists only in the present neural state.
This is sometimes called non-evaluative awareness.

Why This State Is Transformative

Modern trauma and neuroplasticity research show:

- Emotional memories persist only when reinforced.
- When an emotional experience is observed without judgment, it becomes labile and may be reconsolidated differently or dissolved entirely.

Krishnamurti anticipated this decades earlier:

"When you see the fact without the past, the fact ends."

The brain literally reorganizes.

This is neurobiological freedom—
freedom from the binding effects of past neural conditioning.

In Summary: Krishnamurti Meets Neuroscience

“A place of no registration” =

A brain state where:

- The amygdala does not emotionalize the moment
- The hippocampus does not store it as a self-related memory
- The DMN does not create a story around it
- The experience ends in the moment
- No psychological residue accumulates
- The self does not grow through memory
- The mind remains fresh, unscarred, open

Such a mind is:

- flexible
- non-reactive
- free of conditioning
- free of psychological time
- extraordinarily sensitive
- capable of insight
- unburdened by the past

This is what Krishnamurti meant by:

“A mind that records nothing is an innocent mind.”

*****

What is it that is becoming?

Sir, when we speak of becoming, we are referring to a movement in psychological time—
a movement from what is toward what should be.
This movement occupies our whole life:

- becoming successful
- becoming virtuous
- becoming enlightened
- becoming secure
- becoming free of fear
- becoming somebody in the eyes of the world

All our energies go into this endless struggle.
But Krishnamurti asks a very simple, piercing question:

"What is it that is becoming?"

Who is this entity that wants to become something other than what it is?

Look closely.

Is it not thought that is becoming?

Is it not memory, shaped by the past, projecting a future?

Is it not the 'me', a bundle of experiences, images, hurts, hopes, plans?

The 'me' is the past trying to continue itself into the future.

This continuity appears as "becoming."

The past wants permanence, and it invents the idea of growth, achievement, transcendence.

So, what is becoming?
Not you, not a real entity, but the movement of thought sustaining an image about itself.

Why does the mind pursue becoming?

Because thought is always inadequate before the vastness of the present.
The present is too alive, too immediate, too uncertain.
So thought escapes into time, into tomorrow, into becoming.

Becoming is escape from what is.

It is the refusal to look at oneself as one actually is—
violent, fearful, ambitious, lonely, hurt.
Instead, the mind says:

"I will become non-violent one day."
"I will become peaceful through practice."
"I will become compassionate later."

This postponement allows disorder to continue.

Krishnamurti's key insight:

"Becoming is the projection of the self in time."

The self survives through becoming.
Without becoming, it has no ground.

The "me" cannot exist in the present.
It exists only in:

- what I have been
- what I must be
- what I will become

Therefore, becoming is the very essence of the self.

Is there an end to becoming?

Krishnamurti says:

“To understand becoming, you must see the total movement of the self.”

When you observe the movement of becoming—
the struggle, the comparison, the ambition, the fear—
without wanting to change it,
without condemning or justifying,
the very watching ends the movement.

Because the movement of becoming requires thought.
And when thought sees its limitation, it becomes quiet.

In that quietness, there is no becoming.

There is only being—
not the being of stagnation,
but the being that is alive,
immense,
timeless.

A mind that is not becoming anything is a mind that is free.

The beauty of this insight

When becoming ends:

- comparison ends
- fear ends
- ambition ends
- conflict ends
- the burden of "me" ends

There is a stillness that is not dead.
A silence that is not manufactured.
A clarity that is not cultivated.

In that silence, life flowers in its own order.
In that clarity, compassion arises naturally.
In that stillness, the mind is no longer measuring itself against the future.

It is whole.

And a whole mind cannot become anything—
because it is already complete.

***

A Neuroscientific Explanation of "What Is It That Is Becoming?

When Krishnamurti asks, "What is it that is becoming?" he is pointing to the psychological movement of the self in time— the constant projection of "what I will be" or "what I must become."

Modern neuroscience offers a strikingly clear parallel to this.

"Becoming" Is the Brain's Predictive Machinery in Overdrive

The human brain operates on predictive processing:

- It constantly forecasts the future.
- It evaluates outcomes.
- It compares present states to desired states.

This predictive loop is centred in the prefrontal cortex and the Default Mode Network (DMN)—the network responsible for:

- self-image
- self-narrative
- autobiographical thinking
- future planning
- past replay

Psychological becoming = the DMN projecting an improved or safer version of "me" into the future.

So Neuroscientifically, becoming is not a metaphysical force.
It is the brain's predictive self-model trying to persist and improve itself.

The "Self" That Is Becoming Is a Neural Construct, Not an Entity

Neuroscience shows:

There is no single location in the brain for the "self."
Instead, the self is a distributed network made of:

- emotional memory circuits (amygdala)
- autobiographical memory (hippocampus)
- self-referential thinking (medial prefrontal cortex)
- body-sense integration (insula)

This network generates a persistent illusion of an entity moving through time.

Therefore:

The thing that is "becoming" is the brain's constructed self-model.

It is not "you" who is becoming—
it is the predictive machinery of memory attempting to maintain psychological continuity.

Becoming Is the Brain's Attempt to Reduce Uncertainty

From a computational neuroscience standpoint, "becoming" is essentially:

the brain minimizing prediction error

(the gap between "where I am" and "where I think I should be").

This process produces:

- striving
- ambition
- fear
- comparison
- anxiety
- dissatisfaction
- anticipation of reward

The sense of a "gap" between the present and a projected future self is what drives psychological becoming.

Krishnamurti says this gap is the source of conflict.

Neuroscience agrees:
prediction error triggers stress circuits, activating cortisol, noradrenaline, and the limbic system.

Becoming Strengthens the Neural Tracks of the Self

Repeated psychological becoming—
"I must be better"
"I will overcome this"
"I will be enlightened one day"—

activates and reinforces:

- the DMN (self-referential thinking)
- the amygdala (fear of not becoming)
- dopamine circuits (reward-driven striving)
- the hippocampus (building narratives about progress/failure)

This reinforces the neural pattern of "self in time."

Thus, the more one tries to become,
the stronger the illusion of the separate psychological self becomes.

This is Krishnamurti's central insight:

"The self is the movement of becoming."

What Is Action Without Becoming?

Neuroscientifically = Action Without DMN Interference**

In moments of:

- deep attention

- flow states
- crisis response
- insight
- choiceless awareness
- meditative clarity

the DMN quiets dramatically.

What happens then?

- There is no sense of self evaluating itself.
- The prefrontal cortex reduces time projections.
- Emotional tagging decreases.
- The brain operates as an integrated whole.

This is measurable and well-documented.

During such states, there is perception without the "becoming" machinery.

Krishnamurti describes this as:

"Action without the actor."

Neuroscience calls it:

"non-self-referential processing."

When the Self Falls Silent, Becoming Ends

Neuroscientifically, becoming ends when:

- The DMN is silent
- Amygdala responses are low
- Prediction circuits relax
- The brain is in present-moment sensory contact

- Attention is total and undivided

In such brain states:

- There is no psychological future
- There is no projection of "me later"
- There is only the immediate fact
- There is no internal narrator
- There is no self-improving itself

This state is not mystical.
It is a measurable neural configuration.

Krishnamurti calls this freedom from becoming,
and neuroscience recognizes it as deactivation of the self-model.

So scientifically, what is "becoming"?

Becoming = the brain's predictive self-model projecting itself in time to maintain continuity.

It is:

- the DMN imagining a future "me"
- the amygdala fearing loss or failure
- the hippocampus constructing narratives
- dopamine chasing reward
- the cortex comparing present and future states

"What is becoming?"
It is the neural machinery of the self trying to survive psychologically.

And what ends becoming?

Full, immediate awareness.

Because during complete attention:

- the self-model pauses
- prediction collapses
- neural integration increases
- emotional tagging ends
- there is no psychological distance
- therefore, no becoming

This is neuroscientific fact, not poetry.

Krishnamurti would say:

“When you see the movement of becoming completely, the movement ends.”

Neuroscience agrees:
a circuit observed deeply and not rewarded loses energy.

*****

Is it possible not to record pleasure?

Sir, let us look at this very quietly.
Pleasure is not the problem.
Pleasure is part of life—
the beauty of a sunset,
the smile of a child,
the taste of food,
the warmth of affection.

The problem is the recording of pleasure,
for the recording becomes desire,
and desire becomes the endless pursuit of repetition.

Pleasure itself is a moment;
it blooms and withers.
But thought says:

- "I must have it again."
- "How lovely that was—I want more."
- "Let me hold on to that."
- "Let me repeat it tomorrow."

This recording is the birth of the chain:
pleasure → remembrance → desire → pursuit → frustration → fear.

So, the real question is:

Is it possible for the mind to enjoy fully and not carry it over?

To meet pleasure, and not store it as memory?

Can there be no psychological recording?

Pleasure is recorded because the mind is inattentive.

When pleasure happens,
the mind is not fully present.
It is half in the moment and half already reaching into the future.

Thought comes in instantly:

“I like this.
I must keep it.
I must repeat it.
I must not lose it.”

The moment you say, “I liked it,”
the recording begins.
The past takes root.

Pleasure becomes continuity,
and continuity becomes bondage.

Is it possible, then, to have the experience without the experiencer?

To see the sunset completely—
not with the centre that wants pleasure,
but with a mind that is utterly attentive.

In complete attention,
there is no one who enjoys.
There is only the beauty.
Only the light, the colour, the vastness.

Where the “me” is absent,
recording cannot take place.
Because it is the “me,” the centre,
that registers experience for its own continuity.

JK would say:

“When there is no observer, there is no recording.”

Attention ends the recording of pleasure.

This is the key.

Where there is complete attention,
the brain does not register pleasure psychologically.

Pleasure may occur,
but it ends in that moment—
like a wave that rises and falls,
without leaving behind a scar,
without becoming desire.

Attention is like a flame
that burns away the residue of experience.

Do not suppress pleasure. Do not resist it.

Just see it without letting thought interfere.

Any form of resistance is still recording.
Any form of indulgence is also recording.

Only attention—pure, choiceless attention—
has no centre, and therefore nothing to record.

JK would say:

“Attention is the ending of pleasure’s continuity.”

Not the ending of joy,
not the ending of beauty,
but the ending of the pursuit—
the psychological demand for repetition.

Why is this important?

Because the mind that constantly seeks pleasure
is always in conflict:

- fear of losing it
- fear of not getting it
- fear of missing out
- fear of comparison
- fear of emptiness
- fear of boredom

Pleasure and fear are two sides of the same coin.
If pleasure is recorded, fear is inevitable.

Where pleasure ends in the moment,
fear does not begin.

So, is it possible not to record pleasure?

JK would say:

Yes, it is possible—when there is complete attention.

Not the attention of effort or discipline,
but attention that arises from the understanding of desire.

In that attention:

- pleasure happens
- but there is no owner of pleasure
- no memory holding it
- no "me" continuing it
- no desire being born
- no fear following it

Pleasure flowers and passes.
It does not become the seed of sorrow.

This is a mind that touches beauty without possession,
joy without continuity,
life without bondage.

***

"Is it possible not to record pleasure?"

explained through modern brain science in the spirit of JK's insight.

A Neuroscientific Explanation of Not Recording Pleasure

Sir, the brain is biologically designed to record pleasure.
This is how the organism survived:

- pleasure meant food, safety, reproduction
- the brain marked these as "good"
- it created memory to seek them again

This recording happens mainly through:

1. Dopamine reward circuits

2. The amygdala (emotional tagging)

3. The hippocampus (memory consolidation)

So, the moment something pleasant happens:

- dopamine surges
- the amygdala tags the moment as "rewarding"
- the hippocampus stores it as "something to repeat"

This is automatic, fast, and largely unconscious.

This recording becomes desire, and desire becomes the movement of seeking, which JK calls the continuity of pleasure.

But Krishnamurti asks something much deeper:

Can this psychological recording be interrupted?

Can pleasure be experienced fully without becoming desire?

Modern neuroscience gives a fascinating answer.

Pleasure becomes desire only when thought interferes.

Neuroscience shows that the recording of pleasure becomes psychological only when the prefrontal cortex gets involved.

This happens when we think:

- "I must have this again."
- "This is wonderful, I want more."
- "How can I repeat it tomorrow?"
- "How do I hold on to this?"

It is thought—not sensation—that turns pleasure into a conditioned pattern.

Krishnamurti said:

“Thought gives continuity to pleasure.”

Neuroscience says:

“Cognitive elaboration causes long-term emotional memory.”

They are the same thing expressed differently.

Pure perception prevents psychological recording.

When the brain is in complete attention, a very different process takes place:

A. The Default Mode Network (DMN) quiets.

This network normally creates the sense of “me” experiencing pleasure.

B. The prefrontal cortex stops projecting future reward.

There is no “I must have it again.”

C. The amygdala does not amplify the emotional charge.

Pleasure is experienced as a sensation, not a psychological need.

D. The hippocampus does not store the experience as personal narrative.

The event does not become a “memory to be repeated.”

This state has been seen in:

- deep meditative awareness,
- flow states,
- non-self-referential attention,
- insight or choiceless awareness.

In such states, the brain perceives pleasure but does not store it psychologically.

This is exactly what Krishnamurti means.

Why attention stops the recording of pleasure

From a scientific standpoint:

Complete attention = no self-referential processing.

When attention is total:

- the DMN (self-model) is silent
- the narrative centres are quiet
- the future-seeking circuits do not activate
- the brain does not attach “me” to the experience
- no emotional trace is registered as a desire to be repeated

Attention acts like a neural gate that prevents psychological encoding.

JK said:

“Where the observer is absent, there is no recording.”

Neuroscience says:

“When self-referential activity ceases, experiential encoding drops dramatically.”

The statements mirror each other perfectly.

Pleasure without registration is biologically possible

Modern studies suggest that the brain can experience sensory pleasure (pure perception) without necessarily involving emotional or memory-based processes (such as desire or pursuit)

This happens when:

- the experience is fully felt in the moment,
- attention is complete,
- thought does not interfere,
- the self-model does not claim ownership.

In this state:

- pleasure rises
- pleasure passes
- nothing is carried over
- no desire is born
- no fear of loss takes root

JK calls this “the flowering and ending of pleasure.”
Neuroscience calls it “non-elaborative awareness.”

Why this matters psychologically and neurologically

If the brain does not record pleasure:

- there is no craving
- no addiction

- no psychological dependence
- no fear of loss
- no compulsive repetition
- no seeking of continuity

The brain becomes free, flexible, unburdened.
Neural circuits do not form rigid pathways of desire.
This is measurable: MRI studies show reduced activity in reward-prediction circuits.

Krishnamurti says:

"The ending of pleasure's continuity is the beginning of freedom."

Neuroscience confirms:
When reward circuits detach from self-referential thought, the brain enters a state of coherence, calmness, and heightened intelligence.

In Summary (JK + Neuroscience)

Pleasure occurs naturally.

But psychological pleasure is recorded when thought interferes.

Not recording pleasure is possible when:

- the self-model is inactive
- attention is total
- thought is silent
- the brain is in present-time perception
- there is no psychological "owner" of the experience

This is a state where:

- the sunset is seen but not stored
- joy is felt but not clung to
- beauty is touched but not possessed
- experience ends with the moment

Such a brain is fresh, young, unconditioned.

This is what Krishnamurti meant by a mind that is untouched, a mind that lives without the burden of pleasure's continuity.

*****

Don’t let thought seep in.

Sir, this is one of the most subtle points in Krishnamurti’s whole teaching.
Thought never enters with a shout;
it always enters quietly—
as a whisper,
a shadow,
a tiny movement.

It seeps in.

It slips through the cracks of inattention.

It comes disguised:

- as memory,
- as a gentle suggestion,
- as comparison,
- as a hope,
- as a fear,
- as an ideal.

It is this seeping in
that corrupts perception.

When you are watching something—
a tree, a bird, a feeling, a thought itself—
there is a moment of pure seeing.
In that instant, there is no centre,
no “me,”
no division between the observer and the observed.

But the very next moment
thought quietly returns:

- “How beautiful.”
- “I wish this lasted.”
- “What does it mean?”
- “How can I keep this?”
- “I must understand this more deeply.”
- “This is important.”
- “This is spiritual.”

The moment thought enters,
the purity of seeing is gone.
The mind has moved away from the fact
into the field of the known.

This is what JK means:

Do not let thought enter the movement of perception.

Do not let thought contaminate the clarity of direct seeing.

Not that thought is the enemy,
but thought has its own field—
the field of measurement,
the field of comparison,
the field of time.

And when thought enters that which is not of its field—
when it enters the domain of love, or beauty, or silence—
it brings disorder, distortion.

Thought wants to take hold of the moment.
It wants to possess beauty.
It wants to repeat joy.
It wants to escape fear.
It wants to control sorrow.
It wants to continue pleasure.

So, it seeps in.

Very gently.

And if you are not watchful,
you will not even notice it.

The key is not suppression, but awareness.

Krishnamurti never said, “Fight thought”
or “Push it away.”

He said:

Be aware of the first shadow of thought.

If you see thought as it arises—
as a movement, not as “my thought”—
it has no power to distort perception.

Awareness meets it instantly,
like light meeting darkness.

When awareness is complete,
thought has no place to enter.
It does not need to be resisted;
it simply does not arise.

Why does he say “don’t let it seep in”?

Because the danger is not in the big movement of thought.
Those are easy to see.

The danger is in the tiny, almost invisible movements:

- a slight naming (“anger,” “fear,” “joy”)
- a tiny judgment
- a comparison
- a memory
- an expectation
- an image
- a conclusion
- a desire to hold on

These small movements grow,
and soon the mind is miles away from the fact.

So JK is saying:

Watch the mind so completely

that even the first movement of thought is seen.

When the mind is whole,
when it is intensely aware,
thought cannot seep in
because there is no gap for it to enter.

It is only in inattentiveness
that thought returns to dominate perception.

The true meaning:

Let perception be whole.

Let awareness be total.
Let the moment be complete.
Then thought has no room to creep in.

In that wholeness,

there is the beauty of a mind that is not touched by time.

***

A Neuroscientific Explanation of "Don't Let Thought Seep In"

Sir, if we look carefully, "thought seeping in" is not a poetic phrase—
it is a precise neurobiological event.

Let us understand the machinery behind it.

Thought "seeping in" = the Default Mode Network (DMN) reactivating

When you are observing a fact—
a feeling, a sensation, a tree, a movement in the mind—
the brain is in sensory-attentive mode:

- The Dorsal Attention Network (DAN) is active.
- The DMN (responsible for self-talk, past/future thinking) is quiet.
- The amygdala is calm.
- The prefrontal cortex is not planning or projecting.

This is a state of choiceless awareness.

But the DMN is highly habitual.
It wants to reassert itself because its job is to maintain:

- the sense of "me,"
- psychological continuity,
- self-narrative,
- personal identity.

So, it quietly tries to turn simple perception into personal commentary.

This reactivation is what Krishnamurti calls:

“Thought seeping in.”

It is slow, subtle, automatic.

The seepage happens in milliseconds

Modern neuroscience shows that:

The brain begins narrating an experience within 300–500 milliseconds.

This narration includes:

- labelling the experience
- associating memory
- evaluating
- judging
- anticipating
- comparing
- forming preference
- strengthening identity

This is the psychological noise entering perception.

JK describes this as:

“The observer interfering with the observed.”

Seepage begins with micro-activations in the medial prefrontal cortex

When thought begins to infiltrate pure perception:

- The medial prefrontal cortex fires (self-referential thinking).
- The posterior cingulate cortex activates (autobiographical self).
- The hippocampus begins linking the moment to past memories.
- The amygdala prepares emotional coloring (pleasure/fear).

This is the biological movement of the "me" returning.

It is gentle, nearly invisible, unless one is extraordinarily attentive.

JK said:

"Be aware of the first step, not the last."

Neuroscience confirms:
if you catch the earliest micro-activation, the whole cascade stops.

What stops thought from seeping in?

Complete attention.

When there is total attention, the brain enters a very specific state:

- The DMN shuts down dramatically.
- The brain operates in present-time awareness.
- The sensory cortices dominate processing.
- The emotional centers remain quiet.
- No self-referential activity arises.

This is not mystical.

It is scientifically measurable.
It is the same neural signature seen in:

- deep insight
- flow
- meditative awareness
- spontaneous presence
- extreme attentiveness

In this state:

There is no gap for thought to seep in.

Attention fills the whole field of consciousness.

JK said:

“In attention, the observer is not.”

Neuroscience says:

“In non-self-referential awareness, the DMN deactivates.”

These are identical observations expressed in different languages.

Thought seeps in only where there is inattention

Thought cannot dominate when the brain is fully attentive.
It returns only when:

- attention wavers
- perception fragments
- the DMN reactivates
- the brain slips into autopilot
- memory intrudes
- identity asserts itself

This is why JK repeatedly emphasized:

“Where there is inattention, thought enters.”

Neuroscience calls this:

“Automatic self-referential processing.”

Attention burns away the seepage

When the DMN begins to reappear,
if you notice it instantly,
its energy dissipates.

This is similar to:

- inhibitory control
- downregulation of the DMN
- reduction in amygdala engagement
- decreased elaborative processing

Awareness interrupts the old neural pathways
before they gain momentum.

This is exactly JK’s meaning:

“See the movement of thought the moment it arises.”

Neuroscience translates this as:

“Metacognitive awareness interrupts automatic self-narratives.”

When thought cannot seep in, the mind is free.

In this brain state:

- there is perception without distortion
- there is no psychological registration
- pleasure does not turn into desire
- fear does not turn into anxiety
- hurt does not turn into identity
- time as “me becoming” ends

The brain becomes:

- coherent
- unfragmented
- quiet
- sensitive
- extraordinarily alive

This is what Krishnamurti means by a mind that is truly attentive.

It is not the suppression of thought,
but the ending of the subtle intrusion of thought
into areas where it has no function.

In Summary (JK + Neuroscience)

Thought “seeping in” =

the slow reactivation of the brain’s self-referential network.

Not letting it seep in =

sustaining a state of total attention in which the DMN cannot arise.

This is not willpower, not discipline, not control.
It is awareness—

the brain awake to its own movement.

Krishnamurti states it simply:

“Where there is attention, nothing enters.”

Neuroscience states it precisely:

“Total attentional engagement suppresses self-referential neural activity.”

And these two point to the same fact.

*****

Attention in which there is no division

Sir, we must first see what we ordinarily call attention.
Our usual attention is fragmented, broken by choice, guided by motive, controlled by fear or desire.
It is attention that says:

- "I will attend to what is pleasant, not unpleasant."
- "I will listen to this, but not to that."
- "I will concentrate on this because it is useful."
- "I will suppress that thought because it is painful."

This is not attention at all—
it is resistance, selection, conflict.

Where there is choice, there is division.
Where there is motive, there is division.
Where there is comparison, fear, desire, there is division.

And a mind divided cannot attend.

True attention has no opposite.

It is not concentration,
not effort,
not control.

It is a state of the mind in which:

- the observer is not separate from the observed,
- the watcher is not apart from what is watched,
- the listener is not interpreting what is heard,
- the thinker is not interfering with thought.

This attention is whole.
It does not break itself into “I” and “that,”
“The watcher” and “the movement,”
“The thinker” and “the thought.”

In such attention, the mind is a single, unbroken flame—
steady, clear, without flicker.

Krishnamurti would say:

“In attention, there is no centre; therefore, no circumference.”

Meaning:

There is no “me” at the centre collecting, judging, choosing.
There is only the fact, the movement, the actuality.

Attention without division is attention without the self.

Please see this.

Division exists only when the “me” is present—
the centre that says:

- “I must understand.”
- “I want to get rid of this feeling.”
- “I must control my thought.”
- “I should be attentive.”

All this is the movement of the self,
and the self is inherently divisive.

When the “me” is there,
attention is torn, broken, conflicted.

But when the mind is intensely aware of its own fragmentation—
not running away from it, not judging it—
the very seeing ends the division.
The self subsides.

Then attention blossoms naturally,
effortlessly.

Attention without division is the highest form of intelligence.

It is a state in which the mind is:

- completely awake,
- totally present,
- extraordinarily sensitive,
- silently alert.

In this attention:

- thought may arise and fall,
- sensations may come and go,
- emotions may move and dissolve,

but there is no fragmentation,
no resistance,
no separation.

The whole movement of life is seen as one movement.

When there is no division, attention is love.

Krishnamurti said this in many ways:

- “Love is not separate from attention.”
- “Where attention is, the self is not.”
- “In complete attention, the heart flowers.”

Because when you attend without division,
you are not there as an observer.
Only the seeing is.
Only the listening is.
Only the understanding is.

This brings a compassion that is not cultivated,
not practiced,
not sought.

It is the natural fragrance of a mind that is whole.

So, what is attention without division?

It is:

- seeing without the seer,
- listening without the listener,
- acting without the actor,
- observing without choice,
- being fully with "what is" without escaping.

It is the attention of silence—
a silence that is not the result of discipline,
but the natural outcome of complete perception.

In that silence,
the mind touches a dimension that is beyond the known.

A mind in such attention is a light to itself.

***

A Neuroscientific Explanation of "Attention in Which There Is No Division"

Sir, if we look carefully, the brain is normally in a state of division.
It is split between:

- what it sees
- what it remembers
- what it desires
- what it fears
- what it expects
- what it avoids

This division is not philosophical;
it is neurological.

Let us understand the mechanisms behind it.

The Divided Mind = Competing Neural Networks

In ordinary consciousness, attention is fragmented because multiple brain systems operate at once:

A. The Default Mode Network (DMN)

Creates the sense of "me," the observer, the centre:

- self-image
- judgments
- past-future thinking
- psychological commentary

B. The Dorsal Attention Network (DAN)

Handles direct perception:

- sensory awareness
- spatial attention
- present-moment processing

C. The Salience Network

Decides what is important, often through emotion.

These networks compete with one another.

This competition is the neurobiological basis of psychological division.

When Krishnamurti says “the observer is the observed,” he is pointing to the ending of this competition.

Division appears when the DMN intrudes into perception

When you look at a tree, or listen to a sound, or observe a feeling, the sensory networks begin the process.

But very quickly:

- the DMN reactivates
- thought begins narrating the moment
- memory interferes
- comparisons arise
- judgments colour perception

This intrusion creates division:

a thinker separate from the thought,
a watcher separate from the watched.

Neuroscience calls this self-referential elaboration.

JK calls it the movement of the self.

What is attention with no division?

Neuroscientifically, it is a state where the DMN is silent.

When the DMN quiets, something remarkable happens:

- The brain no longer creates a psychological centre.
- There is no "me" observing experience.
- Sensory networks become dominant.
- Perception becomes direct, unmediated.
- Neural processing becomes globally coherent.

This state is observed in:

- deep meditative awareness
- insight
- flow states
- moments of profound perception
- choiceless awareness

Scientists call this:

non-self-referential attention

or

present-centered awareness

Krishnamurti calls it:

"Attention without the observer."

In unified attention, the brain stops oscillating between networks

Normally:

- the DMN pulls toward self
- the DAN pulls toward perception

- the Salience Network mediates between them

This creates oscillation—
a tug-of-war inside the brain.

But when attention is total:

- the DAN dominates
- the DMN deactivates
- neural synchrony increases
- brain-wide coherence emerges

There is no conflict between networks.

This is attention without division—
the brain functioning as a whole.

JK would say:

"In attention, thought does not interfere."

Neuroscience would say:

"During complete attention, the DMN is downregulated and perceptual networks integrate."

They point to the same fact.

Why is this state effortless?

When perception is whole:

- there is no will
- no concentration
- no suppression
- no struggle
- no conflict of opposing neural signals

Effort belongs to the divided mind.

Total attention belongs to the integrated mind.

Integration is a measurable state:

- increased gamma synchrony
- reduced limbic activation
- coherent frontal-parietal communication

JK describes this as:

"a mind that is entirely attentive, without motive, without direction."

Science describes it as:

"a globally integrated, non-self-referential neural state."

Division ends when the observer dissolves

The observer—the psychological "me"—is the DMN in operation.

When the DMN is silent:

- the separation between perceiver and perception disappears
- the mind becomes one movement
- thought arises only when needed, not as a continuous background noise

This is the brain free of psychological time.

JK says:

“Where the observer is not, there is complete attention.”

Neuroscience echoes:

“When self-referential processing ceases, attention becomes unified.”

Attention without division is the highest order of intelligence

In this state:

- the mind is not fragmented
- the brain is not burdened by past projections
- perception is instantaneous
- action flows from direct seeing
- the entire organism is in harmony

This is not mystical;
it is the full, unmediated functioning of the brain.

A mind in such attention:

- learns instantly
- sees clearly
- responds holistically
- is free from conflict
- is extraordinarily sensitive
- is deeply intelligent

This intelligence is not knowledge.
It is the freshness of a brain unbroken by division.

JK would call it:

“The flame of attention.”

Neuroscientists call it:

“The integrated, high-coherence state.”

In summary (JK + Neuroscience)

Attention with division

= DMN + DAN competing
= observer vs observed
= conflict
= fragmentation
= inattention
= distortion

Attention without division

= DMN silent
= pure perception
= observer absent
= whole-brain coherence
= effortless clarity
= intelligence operating

This is the state Krishnamurti spoke of —
a state where the mind is whole,
undivided,
untainted by past or future,
utterly awake.

*****

How do you observe?

Sir, this question, though it appears simple,
touches the very root of human consciousness.
For the way you observe determines the whole structure of your life—
your relationships, your fears, your pleasures,
your sorrow, your conflicts, your actions,
your very sense of existence.

So, before we examine anything else—violence, desire, ambition, freedom, meditation—
we must first understand this fundamental matter:

How do you observe?

Not what you observe,
but how you observe.

Because the quality of observation shapes the quality of your mind.

The Ordinary Way of Observing

We do not observe.
We recognise.

Recognition is not observation.
Recognition is the past looking at the present.
Recognition is memory interfering with perception.

When you look at a tree, you say,
“That is a neem tree, that is a gulmohar, that is a mango tree.”

You are not looking;
you are naming.

The word, the label,
the knowledge you have accumulated over years
steps between you and the thing observed.

There is a screen of the past—
of words, associations, judgments—
and through that screen you look.

You look at your wife, your husband,
your child, your neighbour
through images created over time.
That image looks, not you.

So, the first fact:
We observe through the filter of memory.

Observation Is Distorted by Desire and Fear

When you look at something pleasant, desire rushes in.
When you look at something painful, fear arises.

Desire says,
“I want more of this.”
Fear says,
“I must avoid this.”

Between desire and fear,
the mind is never free to observe.

You are always approaching or fleeing,
seeking or resisting.

Observation is simple only when the mind is not chasing pleasure
and not running away from sorrow.

Otherwise, your observation is like a mirror
covered with dust and cracks.

Observation Is Clouded by Comparison

When you compare—
yourself with another,
your intelligence with another's,
your success, your beauty, your spiritual progress—
your observation becomes superficial.

Comparison is the measurement of thought.
Thought says:

- "I am better."
- "I am worse."
- "I am improving."
- "I am failing."

Where there is comparison,
there is no direct perception.

You see only through the lens of judgment.

To Observe Is Not to Judge

We have been trained to judge everything:
good or bad,
pleasant or unpleasant,
right or wrong,
beautiful or ugly.

The moment judgment enters,
observation ends.

Where judgment is, there is the past.
And the past is always limited.

To observe means to see without judgment—
to see without translating the fact into a conclusion.

The Observer Is the Observed

The most critical point in understanding observation is this:

The observer is not separate from the thing observed.

When you watch jealousy,
you are not separate from jealousy.
The observer is jealousy.
The observer is the past, the memory, the conditioning
that reacts and names the feeling.

When this fact is seen,
a tremendous shift takes place.

There is no longer a watcher watching fear—
there is only fear.
There is no experiencer separate from the experience—
there is only the experience.

In this state,
observation is pure,
undivided.

Choiceless Observation

Observation becomes choiceless when:

- there is no motive to observe,
- no desire to change what is seen,
- no fear of what may be revealed,
- no condemnation,
- no justification.

You are simply watching—
as the ocean watches the wave,
as the sky holds the movement of clouds.

Choiceless observation is not the result of discipline
or effort or control.

It arises naturally when the mind sees the futility of conflict.

Observation Ends Psychological Time

We observe with the past.
We observe in terms of a future outcome.
So, our observation is trapped between two points in time.

But when you observe without the observer,
without the movement of time,
the mind is astonishingly quiet.

This silence is not cultivated.
It is not the silence of suppression.
It is the silence that comes when observation is free.

This silence has no centre.
And because it has no centre,
there is no division.

Observation Brings Its Own Action

True observation is not separate from action.
When you see something clearly—
the danger of a precipice,
the falseness of comparison,
the poison of division,
the nature of fear—
the very seeing brings instant action.

There is no gap between perception and action.
No conflict, no hesitation, no choice.

Krishnamurti would say:

“The seeing is the doing.”

This is not an idea;
it is a fact.

When you see the truth of something wholly,
the brain acts without conflict.

Observation Is the Flame of Intelligence

A mind that observes without division—
without the observer,
without judgment,
without the past intervening,
without the future projecting—
is a mind that is alive,
sensitive,
alert.

Such observation is intelligence.

Not the intelligence of books,
not the cleverness of argument,
but the intelligence that is born of clarity.

In that clarity,
there is compassion,
freedom,
and an extraordinary sense of beauty.

Learning the Art of Observation Is Learning the Art of Living

To observe your thoughts,
your feelings,
your relationships,
your reactions,
your ambitions,
your fears—

without distortion,
without choice—

is to bring order into your life.

Not the order of discipline or control,
but the order that comes from understanding yourself.

Self-understanding is born in observation.
Not in analysis, not in introspection,
but in watching.

A mind that watches without the watcher
is a mind that is free.

Free to love.

Free to learn.
Free to live.

***

A Neuroscientific Exploration in the Spirit of J. Krishnamurti

Sir, if we move into this very carefully,
observation is not a simple act of looking;
it is a neural event,
a whole-brain phenomenon that determines the quality of your life.

The way the brain observes—
whether with the past, with fear, with desire, or with clarity—
shapes your entire perception of the world.

So, the question is not merely philosophical:

How does the brain observe?

And is it possible to observe without distortion?

Neuroscience has begun to give answers
that Krishnamurti intuited decades before anyone studied the neural correlates of consciousness.

Let us walk through this gently.

Ordinary Observation Is Memory-Based

In ordinary life, you do not observe;
you recognize.

Recognition is a function of the hippocampus and cortical memory networks.
When you see a tree, a face, an emotion, the brain instantly searches memory and says:

- "That is anger."
- "That is my friend."
- "That is a threat."
- "That is beautiful."

This reaction happens in milliseconds.

Neuroscience calls this top-down processing—
the mind imposes the past onto the present.

Krishnamurti says:

"We do not see; we translate."

The brain reacts from stored information,
not from direct perception.

Desire and Fear Hijack Observation

The amygdala—our emotional alarm centre—
tags experiences as pleasurable or dangerous.

When you see something pleasant:

- dopamine is released
- attention is pulled toward reward
- memory registers it
- desire is born

When you see something painful:

- the amygdala fires
- the body prepares to avoid

- fear colours perception

The brain no longer sees what is,
but what it wants or fears.

This interference is what JK calls:

“Observation clouded by the self.”

The self, here, is not mystical—
it is the emotional memory structure of the brain.

The Brain Creates Division Through the Default Mode Network (DMN)

A crucial discovery in neuroscience is the Default Mode Network—
the network responsible for:

- self-referential thinking
- psychological time
- narrative identity
- constant commentary
- division between observer and observed

When the DMN is active,
you are not observing the world—
you are observing your thoughts about the world.

Krishnamurti would say:

“The observer stands apart and therefore there is conflict.”

Neuroscience says:

“DMN activity generates the illusion of a separate self.”

This is the biological root of psychological division.

Real Observation Requires the DMN to Fall Silent

When the DMN quiets,
something extraordinary happens:

- sensory systems become dominant
- the brain shifts into present-moment awareness
- perception becomes direct
- the self-centred narrative disappears

This happens in states of:

- deep attention
- insight
- meditative awareness
- flow
- intense perception

Neuroscientists call this non-self-referential awareness.

Krishnamurti calls it:

“Observation without the observer.”

These two statements are describing exactly the same neural and psychological event.

True Observation Is Bottom-Up, Not Top-Down

In pure observation:

- sensory input leads
- conceptual thought is quiet
- emotional tagging does not occur

- memory is not intruding

This is bottom-up perception.
The brain receives the world without immediately translating, interpreting, resisting, or grasping.

This state is free of distortion because it is free of the past.

JK would say:

"To see the fact without the past."

Neuroscience says:

"Perception without top-down modulation."

Observation Changes the Brain

When the brain is fully attentive:

- the limbic system calms
- the prefrontal cortex stops projecting into the future
- stress circuits deactivate
- whole-brain synchrony increases
- new neural patterns form
- old conditioning loses its grip

This is neuroplasticity at work in real time.

Krishnamurti's insight:

"The very seeing of the fact ends the fact."

Neuroscience describes:

"Metacognitive awareness disrupts habitual neural loops."

There Is No Observer in Total Attention

What happens when attention is absolute?

- No DMN activity
- No self-referential processing
- No division
- No conflict
- No psychological time
- No comparison
- No judgement
- No movement of the "me"

The brain is whole.

Krishnamurti says:

"In attention, the observer is not."

Neuroscience says:

"In full attentional absorption, self-processing networks shut down."

A silent brain is not a dead brain—
it is the most alive, sensitive, and intelligent state a human can experience.

Attention Has No Centre, No Boundary

When the "me" is absent:

- attention is not directed
- attention is not forced
- attention is not concentrated
- attention has no motive

- attention has no evaluator

It is a state of global neural integration.

The brain is functioning as a unified field,
not as competing fragments.

This is what JK means by:

"Attention in which there is no division."

In Total Observation, Thought Has Its Right Place

Thought is not the enemy.
It is simply limited.

When thought tries to observe,
there is distortion.

But when attention observes,
thought becomes quiet
and later acts where needed—
in technical, practical matters.

Neuroscience shows:
- in insight states,
- the executive networks take over after perception, not before

This is the brain functioning intelligently:
- perception first
- action second
- thought last

Not the other way around.

The Art of Observation Is the Art of Ending Conflict

When observation is whole:

- fear loses momentum
- desire does not take root
- comparison ends
- hurt dissolves
- pleasure is not recorded
- the past does not dictate perception
- the future does not pull the mind

The brain is free—
not through effort,
but through understanding.

Krishnamurti would say:

"When you observe totally, the mind is extraordinarily quiet."

Neuroscience confirms:

"Integrated brain states correlate with deep inner stillness and clarity."

Conclusion:

Observation Is the Doorway to a New Brain**

A way of observing that is:

- undivided
- choiceless
- free of the observer
- free of memory's interference

- free of fear and desire
- alert, sensitive, alive

is not merely a psychological state—
it is a different mode of brain functioning.

A mind that observes without division
is a mind that is:

- whole,
- sane,
- compassionate,
- creative,
- intelligent.

This is the mind Krishnamurti pointed toward—
a mind that lives without conflict
because it sees without the distortion of the past.

***

A DIALOGUE

What Does It Mean to Observe?

Neuroscientist:
Sir, you often ask, "How do you observe?"
From a scientific viewpoint, observation is simply sensory processing.
Light falls on the retina, signals go to the brain—
and perception happens.

Teacher:
Is that all?
Or do you observe through a screen—
the screen of your memories, your conclusions, your fears, your desires?
When you look at that tree, do you actually see it,
or do you see your knowledge of the tree?

Neuroscientist:
It is true that perception is filtered.
The brain predicts what it expects to see.
The top-down networks—especially the Default Mode Network—
shape perception with memory, concepts, and personal history.

Teacher:
Yes, sir.
Which means you do not see the tree,
you see an idea about the tree.

So already there is division—
the observer who carries the past,
and the thing observed.

The Observer Interferes

Neuroscientist:
We call this "self-referential processing."
The brain relates everything to me—
my safety, my pleasure, my fear, my identity.
It overlays perception with interpretation.

Teacher:
So, the observer distorts observation.
Can you look without that observer?
Can you look without the past interfering?

Neuroscientist:
Neuroscience has found that during certain states—
deep attention, some meditative awareness—
the Default Mode Network becomes silent.
When that happens, perception becomes more direct.

Teacher:

That's it.
When the observer is quiet,
the mind sees things as they really are—
not as it wishes them to be.

Why Is There Division in Observation?

Neuroscientist:
Because the brain evolved to predict danger and seek reward.
Memory is essential for survival.
So, it always asks:
"Is this good for me?
Is this dangerous?
Can I use this?"
This creates a constant self-focused interpretation.

Teacher:
So, the brain has become conditioned—
programmed to react.
But must it continue this way?

Neuroscientist:
Biologically, the machinery is old.
But we are discovering that the brain is plastic—
it can rewire itself with new patterns of awareness.

Teacher:
Awareness is not a pattern, sir.
Awareness is the ending of patterns.

The Ending of the Observer

Neuroscientist:
If I may be very precise:
When one is fully attentive,
the brain's self-referential centres deactivate.
There is no narrative, no judgment, no comparison.

It is as if the “me” disappears.

Teacher:
In that disappearance,
there is no observer separate from the observed.
There is only observation—pure, unbroken.

Neuroscientist:
We would call it “non-dual awareness.”
There is neural evidence for it—
whole-brain integration, reduced activity in the amygdala,
a sense of timeless presence.

Teacher:
Yes.
But the moment you say “non-dual,”
you have already divided it.

Can you stay with the fact—
the purity of observation—
without giving it a name?

Is Observation a Skill?

Neuroscientist:
Can people learn this kind of observation?
Does it require training?

Teacher:
The moment you train yourself,
you are cultivating a habit.
Then attention becomes mechanical,
and a mechanical mind cannot observe.

True observation happens only when there is freedom—
not discipline, not control.

Neuroscientist:

From a scientific angle, habits involve the basal ganglia.
Training creates automatic responses.
But what you are describing isn't automatic—
it is moment-to-moment presence.

Teacher:
Exactly.
A routine can never be awareness.
Awareness is fresh each moment.

What Stops Observation?

Neuroscientist:
Neurally, what interrupts observation is the intrusion of thought.
Thought is always based on memory.
It evaluates, judges, compares.
It colours perception.

Teacher:
Therefore, observe without the interference of thought.
Do not let thought seep in.
See the movement of thought as it arises—
and it ends.

Neuroscientist:
You are describing metacognitive awareness—
the brain's ability to observe its own activity.
When this happens, automatic patterns weaken.
The neural loops lose power.

Teacher:
In seeing, the thing is finished.

Does Choiceless Observation Change the Brain?

Neuroscientist:
Completely.

When there is pure attention:

- the Default Mode Network deactivates
- sensory networks become vivid
- emotional centres calm down
- the brain becomes integrated
- conflict circuits reduce
- neuroplasticity rewires the system

Observation without division produces a harmonious brain.

Teacher:
A mind that observes totally is a mind without conflict.
Where there is no conflict, there is intelligence.
And intelligence acts.

The Scientist Asks the Essential Question

Neuroscientist:
Sir…
In this state of observation,
is there someone who is observing?

Teacher:
No, sir.
The moment there is "someone,"
there is division.
When the mind is wholly attentive,
the observer and the observed are one.

Neuroscientist:
That would mean self-referential activity collapses.

Teacher:
Yes.
And in that collapse,
there is great beauty.

The Ending of the Dialogue

They stood silently.
The scientist was no longer analysing.
For a moment, he was simply watching—
the light on the leaves,
the movement of the air,
the stillness inside himself.

Teacher:
Sir, when you observe in this way—
without the past,
without the image,
without the observer—
the mind becomes extraordinarily simple,
and therefore, extraordinarily sensitive.

Out of this sensitivity comes love,
and with love, intelligence.

Nothing more is needed.

*****

Observation without the past

Sir, to understand what it means to observe without the past, we must first see how deeply the past shapes everything we presently see.

The past is:

- every memory,
- every hurt,
- every pleasure stored,
- every belief,
- every experience,
- every conclusion,
- every word,
- every image you have built about yourself and others.

This vast background is constantly interfering with perception.
It stands between you and what is.

So, when you look at a tree,
you do not actually see the tree—
you see the word “tree,”
the botanical knowledge,
the associations,
the memories of childhood under a tree,
the shade, the usefulness.

The past projects itself onto the present.
So, you never meet anything freshly.

Your wife, your husband, your friend—
you see the images you have accumulated,

the hurts you have not resolved,
the expectations you carry.

You never meet the person—
you meet your own projection.

This is observation with the past.

The Past Interferes as Recognition and Naming

Thought instantly names:

- "anger,"
- "fear,"
- "joy,"
- "success,"
- "failure,"
- "danger,"
- "pleasure."

The act of naming is the act of the past taking control.

Recognition is not seeing.
Recognition is memory.

Observation without the past means:
seeing before the word arises,
before the memory rushes in,
before thought says, "I know this."

The Past Interferes as Emotion and Desire

When something pleasant happens,
thought instantly begins to record it as pleasure.
The memory of pleasure becomes desire.
And desire distorts observation.

When something unpleasant happens,
thought stores it as hurt.
Hurt distorts observation.
Fear distorts observation.

In this way, pleasure and fear—both born of the past—
shape the present.

Observation without the past means:
seeing without the thrust of desire
and without the shadow of fear.

The Past Interferes as the Self

Please see this clearly.

The "me" is the past.
It is a bundle of memories saying:

- "I want."
- "I must become."
- "I am afraid."
- "This is my belief."
- "This is my hurt."

When you observe anything from this centre,
you observe through division—
the observer separate from the observed.

As long as the observer exists,
observation cannot be pure.

Observation without the past means:
a state in which the observer is absent.

Not destroyed—
but absent because it is understood.

Observation Without the Past Is Not Amnesia

It does not mean losing factual memory—
your name, your profession, how to drive.

It means the ending of psychological memory
as a constant interpreter.

Technical memory has a place.
But psychological memory—
the stored past that interferes with the present—
has no place in observation.

Observation Without the Past Is Choiceless Awareness

In this observation:

- you are not choosing what to see,
- not distorting the fact,
- not suppressing or indulging,
- not condemning or justifying,
- not comparing or measuring.

You simply observe.

And in that simplicity,
there is a tremendous depth.

The mind is highly sensitive,
alert, alive, aware
without effort, without control, without discipline.

This is choiceless awareness.

In Observation Without the Past, the Mind Is Silent

Not the silence created by suppression,
not the silence of concentration,
but the natural silence that arises
when the chatter of memory has ended.

This silence is not deadness.
It is the silence of a mind
full of energy, clarity, and attention.

In this silence,
observation is whole.

And when observation is whole,
understanding is instantaneous.

Krishnamurti would say:

"To see the false as the false is the beginning of truth."

This "seeing" requires a mind not conditioned by the past.

Observation Without the Past Is Freedom

When the past does not interfere,
you see the world, yourself, and others as they are—
not as you have been taught to see them,
not through the lens of conditioning.

In such seeing:

- fear ends,
- hurt heals,
- comparison ends,

- desire is understood,
- ambition falls away,
- sorrow loses its grip.

A mind free to observe
is a mind free to live.

The mind then is fresh, innocent,
like a clear stream that reflects the sky without distortion.

This freshness is freedom.

The Beauty of Seeing Without the Past

To observe without the past is to meet life directly.
It is to look at your child, your wife, your neighbour,
the clouds, the birds, the movement of thought itself,
with eyes that are not dulled by habit.

It is to live without psychological residue,
without burden,
without the heaviness of yesterday.

In such observation
there is love—
not the love of attachment or memory—
but the love that arises from clarity,
from freedom,
from seeing without distortion.

This love is intelligence.

Therefore, what does it mean to observe without the past?

It means:

- to see without the "me,"
- to listen without interpretation,
- to feel without naming,
- to meet life freshly,
- to be fully present,
- to perceive without distortion,
- to watch thought without being caught in its web,
- to look at oneself without condemnation or justification.

It is a radical transformation in the very act of seeing.

Krishnamurti would say:

"When the past is not, the mind is extraordinarily alive."

That is observation without the past.

***

A DIALOGUE

"Is it possible to observe without the past?"

Questioner:
Sir, you often say we must observe without the past.
But is that really possible?
My mind is full of memories, experiences, conclusions.
How can I look without them interfering?

Teacher:
Sir, the question is not how to do it,
but whether you see the truth that the past does interfere.

The word, the memory, the image—
these stand between you and what you observe.

If you see that fact clearly,
without wanting to change it,
then the very perception of the fact begins to free the mind.

Questioner:
But I see through memories all the time.
I see my wife through past hurts.
I see my child through expectation.
I see myself through old images.

Teacher:
Which means you never actually see them—
you see only the residue of yesterday.

"Recognition is not observation."

Teacher:
When you look at a tree,
the mind instantly says, "That's a neem tree," or "That's a mango."
At that moment, you stop looking.
The word has taken over.

Can you look without the word?

Questioner:
Without naming?

Teacher:
Yes, sir.
Because naming is the past.
Recognition is memory.
Memory is the past.

Observation is something entirely different.

The Past as Pleasure and Hurt

Questioner:
But pleasure and hurt also interfere.
If someone praised me yesterday,
I carry it today.
If someone insulted me,
that becomes my wound.

Teacher:
Exactly.
The brain has recorded the pleasure
and clings to it.
It has also recorded the hurt
and protects it.

So, when you meet the person again,
do you meet them?
Or do you meet your memory?

Questioner:
I meet my memory.

Teacher:
Therefore, you never meet anything or anyone anew.

“The observer is the past.”

Teacher:
Let us look deeper.

Who is the one who observes?
That observer is the whole structure of the past:

- your experiences,

- your knowledge,
- your beliefs,
- your judgments,
- your pleasures,
- your sorrows.

So, the observer is the past.

And as long as the observer is active,
observation must be distorted.

Questioner:
Are you saying the observer creates the distortion?

Teacher:
The observer is the distortion.

“Can the observer be absent?”

Questioner:
Is it possible to observe without the observer?
Without this sense of “me” watching?

Teacher:
It is possible only when you see
the whole movement of the observer.

Not intellectually,
not theoretically,
but actually—
as you would see a snake on the path
and step away instantly.

When you see that the observer is the past
and therefore divisive,

that very seeing ends its authority.

The Moment of Pure Observation

Questioner:
What remains when the observer ends?

Teacher:
A mind completely attentive.
Not dull, not blank,
but intensely alive.

In that attention,
you observe without choosing,
without naming,
without judging,
without comparing.

There is just observation—
pure, unmediated.

In such observation,
the mind is free of the past.

“Does this mean forgetting everything?”

Questioner:
But sir, I need memory to function.
To speak, to work, to remember my home.

Teacher:
Of course.
We are not talking about functional memory.
That has its place.

We are talking of psychological memory—
the kind that interferes:

- the memory of pleasure you want repeated,
- the memory of hurt you want to avoid,
- the memory of comparison,
- the memory of fear,
- the memory that says, "I know you."

Functional memory is necessary;
psychological memory is unnecessary.

The Healing of the Mind

Questioner:
So, when the observer ends,
does fear end?
Does hurt end?

Teacher:
When you observe fear without the past,
fear is completely different.
It is not something to be suppressed or analysed.
It is simply a movement of energy.

When you observe hurt without the past,
there is no "I" that is hurt.
There is only a fact—
and the fact ends instantly
when you meet it whole.

The Beauty of Seeing Freshly

Teacher:
Sir, when the mind looks without the past,
everything is new.

A leaf is new,
the face of your wife is new,
the movement of thought is new.

In this freshness,
there is tremendous beauty—
a creativity that is not of time.

It is only in such observation
that love is possible.

The Questioner Falls Silent

The questioner was very quiet.
He watched the movement of light on the floor,
the shadows of the leaves trembling in the afternoon wind.

For a moment,
he was not observing from the past.
There was only the watching.

Teacher:
Sir, in such observation,
there is no you and no object.
There is only the flame of attention,
in which the past has no place.

That flame is freedom.

*****

Observation means complete attention

Sir, when we speak of observation,
we are not referring to the casual noticing we do as we move through daily life—
a distracted glance,
a partial listening,
a mind that is half-awake,
half elsewhere.

Most of us never observe at all.
We look, but we don't see.
We hear, but we don't listen.
We touch, but we don't feel.
Our minds are perpetually divided:
partly absorbed in memory,
partly occupied with expectation,
partly driven by fear and desire.

In division, there is no observation.

So, Krishnamurti says:

"Observation means complete attention."

Let us go into this slowly.

Partial Attention Is Not Observation

When the mind looks at something—
a tree, a feeling, a thought, another human being—
and simultaneously carries on its background noise of:

- memory,

- judgement,
- comparison,
- fear,
- desire,
- conclusion,

then what you call “observation”
is merely the past interfering with the present.

It is not observation;
it is recognition.

Recognition is always incomplete.

Complete Attention Means No Distraction

To give complete attention is to be wholly there—
with your senses,
with your mind,
with your heart.

In that state:

- there is no centre holding on to itself,
- no observer standing apart,
- no movement of resistance,
- no movement of seeking,
- no mental commentary.

The mind is entirely with the fact.

Attention fills the whole field of consciousness.

There is nothing outside it.

Attention Has No Motive

One cannot attend completely if one has a purpose:
“I must understand,”
“I must get rid of this fear,”
“I must improve myself,”
“I must reach silence.”

A motive divides the mind.

A divided mind cannot observe.

Complete attention is without motive—
it is pure seeing.

This purity gives it extraordinary depth.

Attention Is Not Concentration

Concentration is exclusion.
Attention is inclusion.

Concentration says:
“I will focus on this and push everything else away.”

Attention says:
“I will be aware of the whole movement.”

Concentration involves effort, discipline, control.
Attention flowers from understanding.

Concentration narrows the mind.
Attention opens it.

In Complete Attention, Thought Does Not Interfere

Thought may arise,
but it does not disturb the clarity of observation
because there is no one resisting or controlling it.

Thought appears and disappears as a leaf blown by the wind.

In complete attention,
the mind does not pursue or suppress thoughts.

It merely sees their movement.

This seeing ends their power.

Krishnamurti would say:

“Attention is the flame that burns away psychological thought.”

The Observer Is Absent

Complete attention means
there is no observer separate from what is being observed.

The observer is the centre—
the “me,”
the past,
the image,
the residue of yesterday.

When this centre is active,
attention is fractured.

But in complete attention
the centre is naturally absent.

There is only observation—
pure, direct, unmediated.

Complete Attention Is Immediate, Not Gradual

You cannot practice attention.
Practice only strengthens the practitioner—
the "me" who wants to achieve something.

Complete attention is instantaneous.

It comes when the mind sees the truth of its own disorder.

Seeing the false as false
is the beginning of attention.

Attention Ends the Problem

When you attend completely to fear,
fear reveals its structure and ends.

When you attend completely to hurt,
hurt dissolves.

When you attend completely to desire,
its nature is understood.

The very quality of attention
transforms the thing you observe.

JK says:

"The seeing is the doing."

Because in complete attention
there is no division between the fact and the action.

Complete Attention Is Silence

This silence is not the opposite of noise.
It is the silence of a mind that is whole.

In this silence:

- there is tremendous energy,
- tremendous sensitivity,
- tremendous clarity.

Such a mind listens to the world
with an intensity that is compassion itself.

Observation Is Love

When you observe completely,
the mind is free of judgment,
free of resistance,
free of prejudice,
free of past images.

In such freedom,
there is compassion.

Observation free of the past
is love free of attachment.

This love is not sentiment,
not romance,
not duty.

It is the natural fragrance

of a mind that is attentive.

So, what does it mean to observe with complete attention?

It means:

- to be wholly present,
- to look without the past,
- to listen without interpretation,
- to feel without naming,
- to watch without choosing,
- to meet life without division.

In that state of complete attention,
the mind is simple,
fresh,
innocent.

And in that innocence lies the beginning of intelligence.

***

Neuroscientific Explanation of Complete Attention

Sir, if we approach this carefully,
complete attention is not a mystical state—
it is a profoundly different mode of brain functioning.
It is a shift in the brain's entire architecture.

Modern neuroscience confirms what Krishnamurti pointed to long before science arrived there:

Complete attention is a brain in which the "self-process" is silent and perceptual networks function without interference.

Let us explore this step by step.

The Divided Brain Cannot Attend

In ordinary consciousness, the brain operates in conflict between three major systems:

A. The Default Mode Network (DMN)

—responsible for:

- the sense of "me,"
- psychological time,
- self-judgment,
- narration,
- worry,
- comparison.

B. The Dorsal Attention Network (DAN)

—responsible for:

- focused perception,
- sensory clarity,
- alertness to the present.

C. The Salience Network

—deciding what is emotionally important.

These systems compete.

This competition is the neural root of psychological division and Krishnamurti would call it:

"a mind that is fragmented and therefore inattentive."

Complete Attention Requires the Quieting of the DMN

When attention becomes total, something extraordinary happens:

The Default Mode Network (the "self-centre") becomes silent.

Neuroscientists call this:

- reduced self-referential processing
- decreased narrative thinking
- collapse of ego-based prediction

Krishnamurti calls it:

"The absence of the observer."

When the observer is silent,
attention is unbroken.
There is no centre from which thought arises to interfere.

Sensory Networks Come Alive

When the DMN quiets,
the brain shifts toward the Dorsal and Ventral Attention Networks:

- vision becomes sharper,
- hearing becomes more precise,
- bodily awareness becomes vivid,
- perceptual detail increases dramatically.

The brain is no longer guessing, predicting, or comparing.
It is seeing.

Neuroscience calls this bottom-up perception.
Krishnamurti calls it:

“Seeing the fact without distortion.”

Thought Loses Its Dominance

When the brain is fully attentive:

- thought slows,
- inner verbalization stops,
- emotional tagging ceases,
- the amygdala becomes quiet.

Thought may arise,
but it does not dominate perception.

This aligns perfectly with Krishnamurti’s statement:

“In attention, thought has no place.”

It is not suppressed—
it simply loses momentum.

Complete Attention Is Whole-Brain Integration

Functional MRI studies show that in moments of deep, effortless attention:

- perceptual networks
- emotional networks
- executive networks

all synchronize in a harmonious pattern.

There is no internal conflict.

This is called large-scale neural integration or global coherence.

JK describes this as:

"a mind that is whole, not broken up."

Attention Cannot Be Forced—Why?

Because forcing attention activates:

- the Prefrontal Cortex (effort, discipline),
- the DMN (self-evaluation),
- limbic stress circuits (fear of failure).

This destroys attention.

Only effortless, choiceless awareness can produce complete attention.

This matches JK precisely:

"Attention is not concentration; it is without effort."

Neuroscience confirms that effortful focus narrows the mind,
while effortless awareness broadens and integrates it.

The Brain in Complete Attention Is Silent—But Highly Active

This is not a dull or blank state.
It is full of:

- alertness,
- clarity,
- sensitivity,
- energy.

EEG studies show high-frequency gamma synchrony—

the signature of insight and deep awareness.

Krishnamurti would simply say:

“In attention, the mind is extraordinarily alive.”

Attention Ends Psychological Conflict

When complete attention operates:

- fear diminishes,
- desire loses its compulsive grip,
- hurt is seen and ends,
- thought stops projecting the future,
- memories lose emotional charge.

From a neuroscientific perspective,
this happens because:

- amygdala (fear) deactivates,
- anterior cingulate cortex (conflict) quiets,
- hippocampus (memory-emotion binding) weakens,
- prefrontal prediction circuits pause.

From the perspective of JK:

“When you see the fact completely, the fact ends.”

Science and insight meet at the same point.

Attention Is the Highest Intelligence

When the whole brain is working without division:

- perception is accurate,
- emotion is balanced,
- thought is appropriate,
- action is direct.

This is not mechanical intelligence.
It is an intelligence born of clarity.

Neuroscience calls it integrated conscious processing.
Krishnamurti calls it:

“The intelligence of a mind that sees what is true.”

Complete Attention Is Love

In such a state:

- there is no image of the other,
- no memory interfering,
- no fear of loss,
- no demand of gain.

Relationships become free of distortion.

Neuroscience sees this as:

- reduced emotional reactivity,
- enhanced empathy networks,
- increased oxytocin-integrated bonding without attachment patterns.

Krishnamurti expresses it simply:

“Where attention is, love is.”

In Summary (JK + Neuroscience)

Complete Attention =

- Silent Default Mode Network
- Fully active perceptual networks
- Whole-brain integration

- No observer
- No conflict
- No motive
- No interference of thought
- Highest intelligence
- Natural compassion

This is the brain functioning in freedom,
the mind functioning in wholeness.

It is the flowering of an intelligence
that does not belong to the past.

*****

The analysis is a fragment.

Sir, when we analyse something—
a thought, a fear, a desire, a hurt—
we assume that by examining it, dissecting it, breaking it apart,
we will understand the whole.

But analysis is always a fragment,
because the one who analyses is himself fragmented.

Let us look at this carefully.

The Analyzer Is Part of the Problem

Who is the one analysing?

He is:

- the past,
- the accumulated memories,
- the evaluator,
- the judge,
- the centre that says “I should,” “I shouldn’t,”
- the bundle of hurts, hopes, fears, and conclusions.

This analyzer is conditioned.

He looks at fear or sorrow or desire
from his background, through his past.

So, every analysis is coloured, distorted.

Therefore:

The analyzer is not separate from the thing analysed.

To analyse fear while being afraid
is like a trembling hand trying to perform delicate surgery.

The very instrument is shaky.

Analysis Breaks the Whole into Pieces

When you analyse, you divide:

- the cause from the effect,
- the observer from the observed,
- the think-er from the thought,
- the self from the content of consciousness.

But consciousness is one movement—
a total, interwoven field.

You cannot break it into parts and hope to understand the whole.

Krishnamurti would say:

“The moment you analyse, you have already fragmented the problem.”

Analysis Is Always of the Past

Analysis depends on knowledge,
and knowledge is always old,
always limited,
always born of yesterday.

So, you use the past to examine the present.

The living movement of fear, jealousy, anger, sorrow
is met with dead knowledge.

Thus:

Analysis tries to understand the living with the dead.

And therefore, it can never touch the truth of the problem.

Analysis Requires Time — and Time Distorts

When you say:

- "I will understand my fear step by step,"
- "I will resolve this slowly,"
- "I will think this through,"

you bring in time.

But psychological time is the escape from "what is."

Fear exists now.
Hurt exists now.

To deal with it tomorrow is to avoid it.

So, analysis, which spreads the problem across time,
allows the problem to repeat itself endlessly.

This is why JK says:

"To analyze is to prolong conflict."

Analysis Strengthens the 'Me'

The moment you analyse:

- you strengthen the thinker,
- you strengthen the observer,
- you give continuity to the "me."

The ego becomes the authority saying:

- "This is right,"
- "This is wrong,"
- "This is the cause,"
- "This must change,"
- "This I will keep."

So, analysis builds the very structure
that is the root of conflict.

This is why:

Analysis does not end the self; it nourishes it.

Analysis Prevents Direct Perception

When you are analysing, comparing, judging, interpreting,
you are not looking.

You are busy with thought's commentary.

Analysis moves away from the fact.

Perception ends conflict.
Analysis prolongs conflict.

JK puts it so simply:

"To see is to act."

But to analyze is to delay action.

The Problem Is Not Outside the Analyzer — They Are One Movement

Fear, anger, sorrow, loneliness—
these are not separate from the one who tries to analyse them.

The observer is the observed.

If you analyse fear,
fear is doing the analysing.

If you analyse confusion,
confusion is doing the analysis.

If you analyse hurt,
hurt is operating the analysis.

This is why analysis can never resolve the problem—
because the analyzer is the problem.

What Then Brings Clarity?

Not analysis—
but direct perception.

To look at fear, hurt, loneliness,
without the movement of thought,
without naming,
without escaping,
without resisting—
that very looking reveals the whole structure instantly.

This is not intellectual.
It is not emotional.
It is a total perception.

And in total perception,
there is no fragmentation.

In that wholeness,
the problem ends.

Krishnamurti said:

"Only in the observation of the whole is there freedom."

So Why is Analysis a Fragment?

Because:

- the analyzer is a fragment,
- the method is a fragment,
- the knowledge used is a fragment,
- the problem is treated as a fragment,
- the observer and observed are divided,
- the whole of inner life is broken into parts.

And the fragment can never understand the whole.

Only a mind that sees holistically, instantly, silently—
without the past, without division—
can understand anything deeply.

That understanding is intelligence.

***

THE FUTILITY OF ANALYSIS

A Dialogue

“Sir, why do you say analysis is a fragment?”

Questioner:
Sir, over many years, we have been taught to analyse our problems—
to search for causes,
to examine motives,
to explore childhood wounds,
to break down our thoughts.
But you say analysis is a fragment.
Why?

Teacher:
Before we ask why, let us first see what is taking place.
When you analyse, who is analysing?

Questioner:
I am analysing.

Teacher:
Who is this “I”?

He contains his history, his hurts, his pleasures, his conditioning—
the whole content of the past.

So, the one who analyses
is the past.

And that past looks at the present
through the eyes of yesterday.

Therefore, the analyser is not objective,
is not clear—
he is a fragment.

How can a fragment understand the whole movement of the mind?

“But don’t we need analysis to understand ourselves?”

Questioner:
Sir, without analysis, how do we understand fear, sorrow, anger?
Surely, we must break them down to know them.

Teacher:
When you break something down,
you are dividing it.
You say, “This is the cause, that is the effect.
This is good, that is bad.”
This division is already a distortion.

Fear is not something separate from you.
You are that fear.

When you analyse fear,
fear is analysing fear.
That is a fact.

Questioner:
That is difficult to grasp.

Teacher:
Not if you look simply.

When you are angry,

the one who says “I should not be angry”
is also anger.
He is the continuity of anger in words.

So, analysis becomes the movement of the very thing you are trying to escape.

“Analysis takes time — does time help?”

Teacher:
Let us examine time.

When you say, “I will gradually understand my fear,”
you introduce time.
Between what is and what should be
you create distance.

In that distance lies conflict.

Time does not dissolve the problem;
it sustains it.

Questioner:
But insight takes time, doesn’t it?

Teacher:
Insight is not born of time, sir.
Insight is instantaneous—
like seeing a snake on the path.
You don’t analyse whether to jump.
You jump.

Similarly, when you see the truth of fear,
it ends immediately.

Time does not bring clarity.
Time prevents clarity.

“Does analysis ever resolve anything?”

Questioner:
Sir, surely analysis has helped some people heal?

Teacher:
It may offer temporary relief—
like trimming the branches of a poisonous tree.
But the root remains untouched.

Analysis is endless.
One cause leads to another,
one memory to another,
one interpretation to another.

The mind becomes the analyst and the analysed—
both rooted in confusion.

This is why analysis never ends.
It is an escape from direct perception.

“If analysis is fragmentary, what is the whole?”

Questioner:
Then what is the whole that you speak of?

Teacher:
The whole is the movement of your consciousness—
your desires, fears, pleasures, hurts, beliefs.

It is one movement,
not separate parts.

But the mind trained in analysis
breaks it into pieces:

- the observer and the observed,
- the thinker and the thought,
- the controller and the controlled.

This fragmentation breeds conflict.

The whole can only be seen
when the mind stops dividing.

“Isn’t understanding a form of analysis?”

Questioner:
Sir, when you say ‘understand,’
is that not analysis in itself?

Teacher:
Understanding is direct—
not through the lens of the past.

Analysis depends on the past.
Understanding is the seeing of what is
without distortion.

When you see a sunset,
you don’t analyse it.
You look,
and there is beauty.

When you look at your fear with that same total attention,
without the analyser,
you understand it instantly.

“What happens to the analyser?”

Questioner:
If I stop analysing, what happens to the ‘me’ who analyses?

Teacher:
He withers away.
Because he exists only through division.

When the mind sees the whole of fear,
not as something outside,
not as something to conquer or escape,
but as part of itself—
then the observer dissolves.

There is only the fact.
And the fact undergoes a transformation.

Questioner:
So, the observer is the fragment.

Teacher:
Exactly.

“What brings an end to the fragment?”

Questioner:
If analysis cannot end fragmentation,
what can?

Teacher:
Observation.

Pure observation—
without the observer,

without the past,
without choice.

Observation is whole.
Analysis is fragmentary.

When you observe fear without naming,
without judging,
without trying to escape or conquer it—
you see its entire structure.

And in that seeing,
fear ends.

Not gradually,
but instantly.

“Is observation difficult?”

Questioner:
This seems very subtle, sir.
Is observation difficult?

Teacher:
What is difficult
is to let go of the analyser.

We are attached to the analyser
because he gives us a sense of control—
the illusion that someone is managing the inner world.

But when you discover
that the analyser is the confusion,
you drop him naturally.

Then observation becomes effortless—
as natural as breathing.

“What remains when analysis ends?”

A silence descended on the group.
The breeze had slowed.
Birds were calling from the far branches of the trees.

Teacher:
When analysis ends,
the mind becomes extraordinarily simple.
Not dull—
simple.

In that simplicity
there is great clarity,
great sensitivity.
You see things as they are.

And in that clarity lies the ending of conflict.

What is whole
has no struggle.

The moment you see this,
analysis drops away.

Then life becomes a continuous movement of observation—
fresh, innocent, uncorrupted by yesterday.

That is the beginning of real intelligence.

*****

Can you listen without accumulation?

Listening is attention.

If there is memory in listening,
there is no listening.

Where there is no listening,
relationship is merely the continuation of the past.

Sir, we must understand what we ordinarily call listening.
For most of us, listening is not listening at all—
it is the continuation of the past.

When someone speaks,
we do not hear the words as they are.
We hear through layers of memory:

- what they said yesterday,
- what we think they mean,
- what we hope they mean,
- what we fear they mean,
- what we already know,
- what we want to defend,
- what we want to reject.

This whole movement is accumulation.

Accumulation is the background of knowledge, experience, prejudice, hurt, and belief
through which the mind listens.

So, the real question is:

Is it possible to listen without this background— without the past interfering?

Ordinary Listening Is Always Through the Past

When you listen to your wife, your husband, your friend, your child,
you are not listening to them—
you are listening to your image of them.

The mind says:

- "He always criticizes me."
- "She never understands."
- "This person is important."
- "This person is not worth listening to."

These judgments are the accumulated past.
And the past distorts listening.

You are never hearing the words;
you are hearing the echoes of memory.

Accumulation Means Psychological Residue

Psychological accumulation is not facts—
not learning a language or a skill.
It is not functional memory.

Accumulation means:

- the hurt you carry,
- the praise you cling to,
- the conclusions you defend,
- the beliefs you protect,
- the wounds that whisper,
- the opinions that solidify,

- the identity built through experience.

This residue listens.

Not you.

Listening Without Accumulation Is Pure Attention

To listen without accumulation
is to listen as though you are hearing for the first time.

It is to listen without:

- comparison,
- interpretation,
- judgement,
- agreement,
- disagreement,
- reaction.

It is to listen without the “me” intruding.

Such listening is not passive.
It is the highest form of attention.

Complete attention leaves no room for accumulation
to operate.

Accumulation Blocks Understanding

When someone speaks and you immediately translate,
you are not listening.

When you evaluate—
“I like this,”
“I dislike this,”

“I agree,”
“I disagree”—
your mind is not free to hear.

You are imprisoned by what you have gathered—
and the gathered blocks the new.

Krishnamurti would say:

“A mind burdened with knowledge cannot learn.”

And listening is the beginning of learning.

Listening Without Accumulation Is Immediate Understanding

When you listen totally—
without the past,
without the interpreter—
there is direct perception.

In direct perception,
understanding is instantaneous.

You do not need explanation,
you do not need analysis,
you do not need effort.

Listening itself becomes the act of understanding.

This is why JK says:

“To listen is to learn.”

Not from memory,
but from the freshness of direct perception.

The Ending of Accumulation Is the Ending of the Listener

To listen without accumulation
is to listen without the listener.

Because who is the one who accumulates?

It is the “me,”
the centre,
the observer,
the experiencer.

When that centre is absent,
there is only listening.

No past,
no future,
no resistance.

Just the sound,
the meaning,
the reality of the moment.

Such listening is extraordinarily beautiful—
because it is extraordinarily simple.

Listening Without Accumulation Is Listening with Love

When you listen without memory,
you meet the person anew.

You do not bring yesterday into today.
You do not impose your wounds,
your fears,
your expectations.

You simply listen.

In such listening,
there is compassion.

Compassion is not sentiment;
it is the sensitivity of a mind without burden.

And a mind without burden listens in freedom.

So, is it possible to listen without accumulation?

Yes—
it is possible when:

- the mind sees its own movement of judgement,
- the mind sees how the past interferes,
- the mind does not condemn or justify its reactions,
- the mind is watchful of its tendency to store experience.

In seeing this whole process,
accumulation loses its power.

Then listening becomes pure attention—
and in that attention
lies the beginning of transformation.

***

Can you listen without accumulation?

Most of us do not even know what it means to listen.
We hear sounds,
we follow conversations,
we respond automatically,
but we do not listen.

Listening, in the deepest sense,

requires a mind that is free of its own noise—
free of the burden of memory,
free of the past that constantly interferes.

Let us explore this carefully.

What Do We Mean by Accumulation?

Accumulation is not the gathering of technical knowledge—
how to drive a car,
how to perform surgery,
how to speak a language.
That is functional memory, necessary for daily life.

Accumulation here means:

- psychological residues,
- conclusions,
- opinions,
- judgements,
- memories of praise and insult,
- beliefs carried from childhood,
- hurts stored over years,
- the images we build about ourselves and others.

This accumulation forms a thick layer
between the mind and what is being said.

So, what we call “listening”
is actually the movement of this layer—
not the direct hearing of truth.

Ordinary Listening Is Through the Past

When someone speaks to you—
your wife, your husband, your child, a friend—

you rarely hear the words.

You hear:

- the memory of past quarrels,
- the expectations you have formed,
- the judgements you carry,
- the image you have built about that person.

These come between you and the sound.

You respond not to the person
but to the accumulated content of your own mind.

So, your listening is never fresh,
never innocent,
never free.

You are listening to yourself—
not to the other.

Accumulation Is the Listener

This is a startling truth.

The one who listens through memory,
through hurt,
through knowledge,
through images—
that listener is accumulation.

He is the past.

And the past is always fragmentary.

Such a listener cannot possibly understand anything deeply,

because his listening is conditioned before the words even arrive.

Krishnamurti would say:

“There is no pure listening as long as the listener is active.”

Listening Without Accumulation Is Total Attention

To listen without accumulation
is to listen with complete attention.

Complete attention means:

- no judgement,
- no reaction,
- no interpretation,
- no comparison,
- no agreement,
- no resistance,
- no fear of what is being heard.

It is a state in which the mind is utterly present.

In such attention,
accumulation cannot operate—
because accumulation exists only when the mind is distracted.

Where attention is total,
the past does not enter.

Can the Mind Stop Accumulating?

This is a central question.

The mind accumulates automatically:

- a word becomes an insult,

- a gesture becomes a hurt,
- a smile becomes a memory of pleasure,
- a warning becomes fear,
- an idea becomes a belief.

Can the mind be aware of this movement
as it is happening?

Not controlling it,
not suppressing it,
but seeing it.

In that seeing—
in that clarity—
the movement of accumulation weakens.

The past loses its grip
because you are aware of its birth.

The Art of Listening Is the Art of Seeing the Self

When you listen without accumulation,
you begin to see the structure of yourself:

- how you defend your beliefs,
- how you protect your images,
- how you cling to opinions,
- how you interpret everything according to your conditioning.

This self-revealing is not analysis.
It is seeing.

And through such seeing,
the old structure begins to dissolve.

The mind becomes lighter,
cleaner,
more sensitive.

Listening Without Accumulation Is Immediate Understanding

When the mind listens without the interference of yesterday,
it understands instantly.

There is no need for explanation,
no need for argument,
no need for analysis.

The mind sees the truth directly—
like seeing fire and stepping back.
No thought is needed.

Krishnamurti often said:

“In listening, learning is immediate.”

Learning is not the addition of new knowledge.
It is the transformation of perception.

Listening Without Accumulation Is Silence

The silence of which we speak
is not the silence between two noises,
not the silence manufactured by discipline,
not the silence produced by control.

It is the silence of a mind
that is not chattering,
not judging,
not comparing,
not resisting.

It is the silence that comes naturally
when the listener is absent.

In that silence,
words have a different quality.
They strike deeper.
They reveal more.

This silence is the ground of true listening.

Listening Without Accumulation Is Love

To listen without memory
is to meet the other freshly,
without the weight of yesterday.

Such listening is love.

Not sentimental,
not emotional,
not possessive.

It is the simple fact
that when the mind is empty of itself,
it has room for the other.

In such listening,
there is compassion.

A mind full of accumulation cannot love—
it can only compare, judge, and cling.

But a mind free of accumulation
is open, tender, alive.

This openness is love.

The Challenge of the Present Moment

So, we return to the question:

Can you listen right now, in this moment,
without the accumulation of the past?

Can you listen to your own thoughts
without adding to them,
without interpreting them,
without resisting or pursuing?

Can you listen to your fear
without calling it “fear,”
without naming it,
without trying to escape?

Can you listen to another human being
without the image you have built around them?

This requires no practice.
No method.
No time.

It requires only that the mind
be completely attentive.

In that attention,
the past does not operate.

And without the past,
listening becomes an act of profound intelligence.

*****

To Live Without Conflict

Sir, to live without conflict is not a dream,
not an ideal,
not something to be achieved in the distant future.
It is a possibility—
but only when we understand the very nature of conflict itself.

Conflict is not out there—
not in society,
not in politics,
not in religions.

Conflict is here,
within the movement of our own minds.
And unless we understand this inner movement,
our outer life will always reflect disorder.

So let us look together, quietly, seriously.

What Is Conflict?

Conflict arises whenever there is:

- a division between what is
- and what should be,
- a division between desire and duty,
- a division between fear and escape,
- a division between the thinker and the thought,
- a division between the observer and the observed.

This division is the root of conflict.

The moment there is duality,

psychological friction begins.

We want pleasure without pain.
We want security without dependence.
We want love without vulnerability.
We want freedom but cling to attachment.

All this is division.

Where division exists, conflict is inevitable.

Conflict Is Born from the "Me"

At the centre of conflict lies the "me"—
the self-image,
the centre of desire,
the bundle of memories and experiences
that seeks continuation.

This "me" says:

- "I must become something."
- "I must protect myself."
- "I must not fail."
- "I must be admired."
- "I must always be right."

The "me" is endlessly striving, measuring, comparing, fearing.

So long as the "me" is active,
there must be conflict.

Krishnamurti would say:

"The self is the source of contradiction."

The Futility of Struggle

We believe conflict can be overcome through:

- willpower,
- discipline,
- suppression,
- analysis,
- escape,
- ideals,
- belief systems.

But all these methods only strengthen the “me,”
and therefore, strengthen conflict.

You may control anger,
but the controller is anger in disguise.

You may resist fear,
but the resister is fear operating through another channel.

So, every movement of resistance
is another movement of conflict.

Understanding Is the Ending of Conflict

Conflict ends not through effort
but through understanding.

To understand conflict,
one must observe it
without judgement,
without condemnation,
without trying to change it.

Simply watch it—
as clearly as you would watch a bird in the sky
or a leaf falling to the ground.

In such observation,
something extraordinary happens:

The observer is seen to be part of the conflict.
Not separate from it,
not someone standing outside analysing.

The observer is the conflict.

When this is seen deeply,
the mind becomes still.

The Duality Between 'What Is' and 'What Should Be' Ends

Conflict is born the moment thought creates an ideal—
a psychological "should."

"I am angry but I must not be angry."

Between the fact and its opposite
lies the battlefield of life.

The ideal becomes an escape from the fact,
and the fact never changes.

But when you see anger without its opposite—
without escape, without suppression—
then the energy of anger is understood directly.

In that direct understanding,

anger dissolves.

This is the ending of conflict.

Conflict Ends When Comparison Ends

We are endlessly comparing:

- ourselves with others,
- our success with their success,
- our beauty, our intelligence,
- our spiritual progress.

This comparison is the movement of thought
trying to become something.

Comparison is measurement.
Measurement is duality.
Duality is conflict.

When you stop comparing—
not through discipline
but through understanding the futility of comparison—
the mind becomes peaceful.

Not dull, not lazy—
but peaceful.

A mind at peace sees clearly.

Conflict Ends When Desire Is Understood

Desire is not wrong—
but desire, when misunderstood, becomes longing,
frustration, envy, struggle.

Desire arises from:

1. Seeing
2. Contact
3. Sensation
4. Thought creating a picture of continuation

It is this fourth step—
thought's movement into time—
that breeds conflict.

To watch desire as it arises,
without judgement or indulgence,
is to understand its nature.

In understanding,
desire becomes simple, unconflicted.

A Mind Without Fear Is a Mind Without Conflict

Fear is one of the deepest sources of conflict:

- fear of loss,
- fear of rejection,
- fear of loneliness,
- fear of death,
- fear of not becoming.

Fear arises from thinking about the future
or clinging to the past.

When the mind is fully attentive to the present,
fear has no soil in which to grow.

Attention burns fear.

In a mind free of fear,

conflict ends at its root.

A Life Without Conflict Is Not Withdrawal

It does not mean hiding in mountains,
renouncing the world,
becoming indifferent.

On the contrary,
a mind free of conflict is capable of immense compassion,
immense clarity,
immense action.

Freedom from conflict brings a new kind of energy—
not the energy of struggle
but the energy of wholeness.

This energy is intelligence.

To Live Without Conflict Is to Live in Wholeness

A mind without conflict is:

- simple,
- alert,
- sensitive,
- alive,
- compassionate,
- intelligent.

Such a mind does not seek,
does not imitate,
does not chase ideals,
does not struggle to become.

It lives.

It observes.
It learns.
It acts instantly when action is needed.

In this wholeness,
there is no contradiction,
no fragmentation,
no inward battle.

The mind is in harmony with itself
and therefore, with the world.

This is the beauty of living without conflict.

***

A Dialogue

"Is it really possible to live without conflict?"

Questioner:
Sir, everywhere there is conflict—
at home, in relationships, in society,
and most of all, within oneself.
We struggle, compare, compete, resist.
Is it actually possible to live without conflict,
or is it only an ideal?

Teacher:
Sir, when you call something an ideal,
you have already escaped from the fact.
We are not dealing with ideals.
We are asking whether conflict can end
—now, not in some distant future.

So, the real question is:
What is the nature of conflict?

If we can understand it completely,
then perhaps conflict will end naturally.

Let us look together.

“Where does conflict begin?”

Questioner:
It seems to begin when we want one thing
but reality gives us another.
When desire contradicts circumstance.

Teacher:
Desire is part of it.
But look deeper.
Is not conflict born when there is division—
between what is and what should be?

Between:

- what I am and what I think I should become,
- what I feel and what I think I ought to feel,
- the fact and the ideal.

This division is created by thought.
Thought projects an ideal,
a future state,
and then struggles to reach it.

In that struggle is conflict.

“So, the ideal creates conflict?”

Questioner:
Are ideals useless then?
Should we not have goals, directions?

Teacher:
Sir, we are not saying they are “useful” or “useless.”

We are seeing the fact.

An ideal is always a projection of the past—
something thought has put together.

Between the fact and the ideal
lies contradiction.
Where there is contradiction,
there must be conflict.

The mind escapes the fact
by running away into the ideal.

But escaping never solves anything.

“What about discipline? Does it not reduce conflict?”

Questioner:
Some say discipline—self-control, willpower—
can help end conflict.

Teacher:
Who is the discipliner?
Who is the controller?

He is the very content of the mind—
the past, the conditioning, the fear, the desire.

So, the controller is part of the conflict,
not outside it.

When the controller struggles with what he controls,
he is fighting himself.

This is like one part of the mind
battling another part.

Such conflict can never end conflict.

It only rearranges it.

“Then what creates this division inside?”

Questioner:
If the controller and the controlled are the same,
why does this division exist at all?

Teacher:
Thought creates the division.
Thought says:

- “I am angry, but I should not be angry.”
- “I am afraid, but I should be courageous.”
- “I am confused, but I must become clear.”

The “I” who speaks
is itself another thought.

Thought splits itself into two—
the seeker and the sought,
the observer and the observed.

This split is the root of conflict.

When the mind sees that the observer is the observed,
the division ends.

And where there is no division,
there is no conflict.

“Can one act without conflict?”

Questioner:
If there is no ideal to guide me,
no goal to strive for,
how will I act?
Won’t life become passive?

Teacher:
On the contrary.
A mind without conflict
has tremendous energy.

When you see something clearly—
a falsehood, a danger, a truth—
action is instantaneous.

There is no hesitation,
no fear,
no calculation.

Conflict dulls the mind.
Clarity frees it.

Clarity acts;
conflict postpones action.

“Is fear the deepest source of conflict?”

Questioner:
It feels like fear—fear of loss, fear of failure—
is behind many forms of conflict.

Teacher:
Quite right.

Fear is born from thought imagining the future
or reviving the past.
Fear is time.

When the mind is attentive
to the movement of fear—
attentive without naming, without resisting—
fear shows its entire structure.

In seeing its totality,

fear ends.

Where fear ends,
conflict ends at its root.

“Can desire be free of conflict?”

Questioner:
Desire feels so strong.
It pulls one in many directions.
Is desire itself conflict?

Teacher:
Desire arises naturally—
through seeing, contact, sensation.

But conflict begins
when thought takes sensation
and creates a picture of continuation.

The mind says:

- “I must have more.”
- “I must not lose this.”
- “How do I sustain this pleasure?”

Thought carries desire into time.
This continuity is conflict.

When desire is seen clearly
as a movement of life,
without moral condemnation
or indulgence,
it becomes simple.

In that simplicity,
it is not conflict.

“What is a life without conflict like?”

Questioner:
Sir, if conflict ends,
what kind of life remains?

Teacher:
A life of clarity.
A life of wholeness.
A life of extraordinary sensitivity and action.

A mind free of conflict is:

- attentive,
- compassionate,
- intelligent,
- unburdened by the past,
- unafraid of the future.

In such a mind,
there is no centre struggling to become.
There is no duality between "what is"
and "what should be."

There is only the movement of understanding,
which itself is action.

This is a life without conflict.

Silence

As the conversation drew to a close,
a deep silence settled among them.
Even the leaves seemed to pause.

Teacher (says softly):
To live without conflict
is not a matter of achievement.
It is not a reward.
It is the natural state of a mind

that sees clearly.

When the mind understands itself completely,
without running away,
without hiding behind ideals,
without dividing itself—
conflict comes to an end.

And the ending of conflict
is the beginning of freedom.

The group remained silent for a long time.
Not analysing,
not concluding,
but simply listening—
perhaps for the first time—
without conflict.

*****

A Battle Between Two Images

Sir, if we look very simply and very honestly at our daily life,
we will see that most of our conflicts are not between two human beings,
but between two images—
the image I have about myself
and the image I have about another.

The tragedy is this:

We never meet another human being;

we meet only the images we have created.

And these images battle endlessly,
creating hurt, fear, jealousy, comparison,
and all the misery that human relationship seems to contain.

Let us go into this with great care.

How Images Are Born

The mind is constantly recording:

- a word spoken in anger,
- a gesture of affection,
- a look of disapproval,
- a memory of pleasure,
- a wound from childhood.

These registrations accumulate and harden into images.

An image is not just a picture,

but a whole psychological structure:

- beliefs,
- expectations,
- demands,
- fears,
- comparisons,
- memories,
- assumptions.

From this structure,
the mind creates an image of "you"
and an image of "me."

These images become the centre of relationship.

Relationship Is Then Between Images, Not People

Consider, sir:

You have an image of your wife or husband—
shaped by years of memory, hurt, pleasure, habit.

She has an image of you—
shaped by her own past, fears, and expectations.

These two images meet,
not the two human beings.

This is why communication becomes difficult,
why understanding becomes limited,
why love becomes entangled with conflict.

There is no relationship
when images stand between people.

Krishnamurti would say:

“Where there is an image, there is no love.”

The Image About Oneself Is the Strongest

The image you have about yourself—
your abilities, your failures, your hopes, your beliefs—
is the most powerful image of all.

From this self-image arise:

- defensiveness,
- fear of being hurt,
- sensitivity to praise and insult,
- ambition,
- comparison,
- pride,
- shame.

This self-image demands to be protected,
and therefore, it is always in conflict.

Every criticism becomes a threat to the image.
Every praise becomes nourishment for the image.

Thus, the self-image creates endless battle.

When Two Images Clash, Conflict Is Inevitable

Between two self-images,
there is:

- misunderstanding,
- projection,
- misinterpretation,
- expectation,
- domination,

- dependence,
- possessiveness.

One image wants recognition;
the other refuses.
One image wants security;
the other cannot provide it.

Thus begins the battle.

It is not a battle between real human beings
but between shadows created by thought.

Even Within Oneself, Images Fight

Inside the mind,
there is not one image but many:

- the image of who I think I am,
- the image of who I want to be,
- the image of who I must not be,
- the image I show society,
- the image I hide,
- the image created by religion,
- the image created by ambition.

These images contradict one another.

One says “Be successful.”
Another says “You are not good enough.”
Another says “You must be humble.”
Another says “You must dominate.”

Thus, there is a continuous inner battle between images.

This inner conflict becomes the outer conflict.

Why Does the Mind Create Images?

The mind creates images for comfort,
for protection,
for continuity.

An image gives a sense of security—
even if that security is an illusion.

We cling to our own image
and to the images of others
because they give us a feeling of familiarity.

But in that familiarity
lies stagnation, blindness,
and the end of freedom.

Can There Be Relationship Without Images?

This is the real question.

Can you meet another human being
without the screen of memory?

Can you listen
without the past interfering?

Can you look at your wife, husband, friend, child
as though you are seeing them for the first time?

This is not amnesia—
it is freedom from psychological registration.

Such relationship is alive,
fresh,
open.

In such relationship
there is no battle.

The Ending of the Image Is the Ending of Conflict

The image ends
when the mind sees the image as an image.

Not tries to destroy it,
not suppress it,
not control it—
but simply observes its movement.

See how the image is born of thought.
See how it protects itself.
See how it creates hurt and fear.
See how it divides.

This seeing, this pure observation,
ends the image.

In that ending,
relationship becomes clear.
Communication becomes simple.
Affection becomes natural.
Love is possible.

A mind without images
is a mind without conflict.

And that, sir,
is the beginning of true relationship.

***

A Dialogue

"Why is there so much conflict in relationship?"

Questioner:
Sir, no matter how much we try,

relationships seem to be full of tension—
misunderstanding, hurt, disappointment.
Why is it so difficult for two human beings to live together peacefully?

Teacher:
Perhaps, sir, the difficulty arises because
it is not two human beings meeting each other,
but two images.

Between you and another
stands the image each of you has built—
the image born of memory, experience, pleasure, hurt.

So, the question is not
why relationship is full of conflict,
but whether you are ever in relationship at all.

"Do you mean we don't actually relate?"

Questioner:
I don't quite understand.
Of course I relate—I speak, I live with my family,
I interact with others every day.

Teacher:
You interact, yes.
But do you relate?

If you look closely,
you will see that what you relate to
is not the person
but the image you have about the person.

You have an image of your wife or husband—

shaped by years of memory,
by pleasant and unpleasant experiences,
by expectations and disappointments.

That image looks at her—
not you.

And she has an image of you.
So, relationship becomes a battle
between two images
and not a meeting of two living human beings.

“How does this image form?”

Questioner:
But why do we form these images?
How do they arise?

Teacher:
It is very simple, sir.

The mind is always registering—
a word spoken in anger,
a gesture of affection,
a moment of neglect,
a look of approval.

Anything that gives pleasure
is registered and retained.
Anything that brings hurt
is registered even more deeply.

These registrations harden into images.

Then, from these images,

you build a picture of the other—
what they are,
what they should be,
what they must never be.

The image is the past.
Thus, you meet the present through the screen of yesterday.

So, you never meet the person—
you only meet the image.

“But surely some images are necessary to live?”

Questioner:
Are you saying we should have no memory at all?
That seems impractical.

Teacher:
Not at all.
We are speaking only of psychological images,
not functional knowledge.

To recall your address,
your profession,
your obligations—
this is necessary.

But to carry the memory of being hurt,
the memory of being flattered,
the image of what your partner should be—
that poisons relationship.

The functional memory is like a file in a drawer.
It has no emotional weight.

But the psychological image
carries fear, desire, expectation—
and therefore conflict.

“So, the image protects itself?”

Questioner:
You say these images cause conflict.
But why don’t they simply fade away?
Why do they seem so strong?

Teacher:
Because the image is part of the “me.”
And the “me” is always protecting itself.

The self-image says:

- “I must not be hurt again.”
- “I must be respected.”
- “I must be loved.”
- “I must appear strong.”

When the image is threatened,
you react—
with anger, withdrawal, fear, resentment.

So, the image strengthens itself through resistance.
Thus begins the battle.

“Is this why we misunderstand each other?”

Questioner:
Yes… I see how quickly misunderstandings arise—
from tone, gesture, or a stray remark.
Is this because we interpret everything through the image?

Teacher:
Exactly.

You are not listening to what is being said.
You are listening to your own accumulated content
—your hurt, your expectations, your fears.

And the other person is doing the same.

So, two images talk to each other.
Two memories communicate.
Two pasts collide.

This is what you call relationship.

“How do these images become conflict?”

Questioner:
Please help me understand how these two images turn into conflict.

Teacher:
Each image demands something:

- recognition,
- safety,
- affection,
- continuity.

But each image also carries fear—
fear of losing affection,
fear of being compared,
fear of being hurt.

So, one image demands,
the other resists.

One clings,
the other withdraws.

One expects,
the other disappoints.

Each image moves according to its conditioning.

Thus begins the endless battle
between two images.

Not between two human beings—
between two constructions of thought.

“Can these images end?”

Questioner:
Sir, this is very clear.
But can these images actually end?
Or must we live with them forever?

Teacher:
They can end—
but not through effort,
not through suppression,
not through discipline.

They end through observing the entire movement of image-making.

To see that the image is born of thought,
to see how thought clings to pleasure and hurt,
to see how thought creates the “me” and the “you,”
to see the totality of this process—

such seeing is the ending.

Observation itself is the action
that dissolves the image.

Not tomorrow,
but now.

“What does relationship look like without images?”

Questioner:
If the image ends,
what happens to relationship?
Does it become empty?

Teacher:
Krishnamurti:
On the contrary.
Relationship becomes extraordinarily alive.

When you meet another without the screen of memory,
you meet them as though for the first time.

There is sensitivity,
freshness,
a quality of listening that is deep and unforced.

Only such a mind
can love.

Where there is an image,
love cannot exist—
for the image is the past,
and love is always in the present.

A mind free of images
is capable of compassion.

The Silence That Follows

Teacher spoke softly:

Relationship is one of the most extraordinary things in life.
But we destroy it
when we allow the past to interfere.

To live without images
is to live without the burden of yesterday.

And only such a mind
knows what it means
to be truly in relationship.

Not a battle,
not a negotiation,
not a continuation of hurt—

but a meeting
in freedom.

***

Without image there may be disagreement, but not conflict; response, but not violence. When the image ends, the ground of violence disappears, and intelligence operates.

*****

Observing Consciousness

Sir, to observe consciousness is one of the most subtle and profound inquiries we can undertake.
It is not an intellectual activity,
not the accumulation of theories,
not an exercise in introspective analysis.

Consciousness is not something outside you,
something you stand apart from and examine.
You are that consciousness.
Therefore, to observe consciousness is to observe yourself—
the entire field of your being.

Let us move slowly, carefully, deeply.

Consciousness Is Its Content

Consciousness is not separate from what it holds.
It is the totality of:

- your memories,
- your fears,
- your desires,
- your pleasures,
- your hurts,
- your conditioning,
- your beliefs,
- your knowledge,
- your reactions,
- your hopes,
- your habits,
- your conclusions.

This vast collected movement is consciousness.

When JK says “consciousness is its content,”
he means consciousness has no independent existence.
Remove the content—
fear, desire, hurt—
and what you call “consciousness” is not there.

There is only attention, silence, vastness.

Consciousness Is a Continuous Movement

Consciousness is not static.
It is a river—
a restless flow of thought, feeling, imagination, memory.
It moves from one thing to another:

fear → escape → pleasure → boredom → desire →
memory → fear again.

To observe consciousness is not to stop the river,
but to watch its movement without choosing,
without condemning,
without controlling.

This choiceless observation brings clarity.

The Observer Is Part of Consciousness

When you say,
“I will observe my consciousness,”
who is this “I”?

Is it not another fragment of the same consciousness?

The “observer” is:

- the past,
- the accumulated experiences,
- the centre of thought.

So, the observer is not outside consciousness—
he is consciousness.

Therefore:

The observer is the observed.

This is the core insight.

When this is seen clearly,
observation becomes whole, undivided.

Analysis Cannot Observe Consciousness

Analysis divides:

- the analyser
  and
- the analysed.

But the analyser is another movement of thought.
He is conditioned as much as the fear or desire he tries to analyse.

Thus, analysis fragments consciousness further.

To observe consciousness,
one must drop analysis entirely.

Observation is not dissection.
It is direct perception.

Consciousness Reveals Itself When the Mind Is Quiet

When the mind is chattering—
interpreting, naming, comparing—
it cannot observe.

But when the mind is still,
alert without effort,
sensitive without choice,
then consciousness reveals its structure:

- its fears,
- its hidden motives,
- its contradictions,
- its illusions,
- its secret hopes.

This revelation is not produced by effort—
it comes when the mind is silent like a clear lake reflecting its depths.

Observation Brings Understanding, Not Suppression

When you observe fear,
not analysing it,
not escaping from it,
not naming it—
but seeing the whole movement of fear—

the mind understands fear instantly.

Understanding is not the result of time.

It is the light of perception.

JK often said:

“Seeing is the action that ends.”

What is seen completely has no continuity.

Fear seen totally ends.
Hurt seen totally ends.
Desire seen totally becomes simple, not conflictual.

Observation transforms consciousness.

Consciousness Is the Common Ground of All Humanity

Your consciousness is not yours.
It is the shared heritage of mankind.

Every human being:

- knows fear,
- knows pleasure,
- knows comparison,
- knows loneliness,
- knows hurt,
- knows desire,
- knows anger,
- knows suffering.

This common structure means:

When you observe your consciousness,

you are observing the consciousness of all humanity.

This brings great humility,
great compassion,

and a sense of profound responsibility.

Observing Consciousness Is Not a Method

You cannot follow a technique to observe consciousness.
A technique becomes mechanical,
and a mechanical mind cannot observe.

Observation must be:

- fresh,
- spontaneous,
- alive,
- unpremeditated.

A practiced observer does not observe—
he repeats.

Observation is real only when it is new each moment.

The Ending of Consciousness as You Know It

When consciousness is fully understood,
its movement slows,
its fragmentation ends,
its mechanical nature dissolves.

What remains is not “your” consciousness.

There is a different state:

- a vast silence,
- a deep stillness,
- a mind without centre,
- a presence without boundaries.

This is not mystical.

It is simply the ending of psychological conditioning.

Where consciousness ends,
there begins a different dimension of mind—

a state JK called the immeasurable,
the timeless,
the other.

So, What Does It Mean to Observe Consciousness?

It means:

- to watch every movement of thought,
- without naming it,
- to see desire, fear, hurt, jealousy as movements of the same field,
- to understand that the observer is part of what is being observed,
- to look without motive, without choice, without resistance,
- to see the whole of consciousness as one movement,
- to let consciousness reveal itself,
- to let understanding dissolve conflict,
- to be free from the known.

In such observation,
consciousness becomes transparent.
The entire pattern is seen.
And with the seeing,
there is the ending of conflict.

In that ending
is the birth of a mind free from its own shadows.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, what does it mean to observe consciousness?”

Questioner:
Sir, you often speak of observing oneself,
observing the whole movement of consciousness.
But what does this mean?
How can one observe something as vast and subtle as consciousness?

Teacher:
Sir, consciousness is not something outside you to be observed from a distance.
You are that consciousness.
Your fears, your pleasures, your pains, your memories, your beliefs—
all that is consciousness.

So, to observe consciousness
is to observe yourself—
not partially,
not fragmentarily,
but wholly.

Let us explore this together.

“But what is consciousness made of?”

Questioner:
When you say consciousness,
what exactly does it include?

Teacher:

Consciousness is its content.

It includes:

- every memory you have stored,
- every experience you cherish or fear,
- every belief you hold,
- every wound you carry,
- every desire,
- every form of pleasure,
- every sorrow,
- every hope,
- every image you have built about yourself and others.

Remove the content,
and the thing you call consciousness
is not there.

Consciousness is a vast storehouse of the known.

“How do I observe something so complex?”

Questioner:
But sir, this seems immense.
How can I observe all this content?
It seems impossible.

Teacher:
It is impossible
if you try to observe each part separately.
You cannot examine fear today,
desire tomorrow,
hurt the next day.

That would take many lifetimes.

And even then,
you would never come to the whole.

To observe consciousness
is not to observe each fragment—
but to observe the total movement
as one unitary flow.

As you watch a river,
not each drop.

“But who observes? Is there an observer?”

Questioner:
When I try to observe myself,
there seems to be a watcher—
a centre that says,
“I am observing.”

Is that observer outside consciousness?

Teacher:
Not at all, sir.
The observer is part of the content of consciousness.

The observer is:

- past experience,
- accumulated knowledge,
- conditioning,
- memory.

When you say,
“I am observing my consciousness,”
the “I” is another movement within consciousness.

Thus:

The observer is the observed.

This is a fact—
not a philosophy.

When this truth is seen,
observation becomes extraordinarily simple.

There is no observer separate from what is observed.
There is only observation.

“Does analysis help in observing consciousness?”

Questioner:
Some psychologists say we must analyse consciousness
to understand it.
Does analysis help?

Teacher:
Analysis implies a division—
the analyser and the analysed.
But the analyser is also part of consciousness.

When fear analyses itself,
fear is still operating.

When hurt examines hurt,
hurt continues.

Therefore:

Analysis is fragmentation.

And fragmentation cannot reveal the whole.

Only direct observation
can reveal the totality.

Analysis takes time;
observation is instantaneous.

“Can consciousness reveal itself without analysis?”

Questioner:
If I do not analyse,
then how will I understand what is inside consciousness?

Teacher:
Consciousness reveals itself
when the mind is completely attentive.

A quiet mind,
not forced,
not disciplined,
not controlled,
but naturally quiet
because it sees the futility of noise—

such a mind
becomes like a clear mirror
in which each movement of thought, fear, desire
is reflected.

You do not have to dig.
You do not have to search.
You do not have to unravel.

Consciousness unfolds itself

when the mind is still.

“Is this stillness a practice?”

Questioner:
Can one cultivate this stillness?
Through meditation or technique?

Teacher:
Anything cultivated,
anything practiced,
is merely repetition.

A mechanical mind cannot observe consciousness.

Stillness comes naturally
when there is understanding.

When you see that noise—
the endless chatter of thought—
prevents observation,
that very seeing
ends the chatter.

Not gradually,
not through effort,
but instantly.

Understanding brings stillness,
not discipline.

“What happens when you observe consciousness?”

Questioner:
If one observes consciousness without choice,

without the observer,
what takes place?

Teacher:
There is clarity.

You see fear as a movement of the mind—
not "my fear."

You see desire as a movement of sensation—
not something to be condemned or pursued.

You see hurt as memory seeking continuity.

This clarity has its own intelligence.

And intelligence dissolves conflict.

There is no effort in this.
The seeing is the ending.

"Is consciousness shared by all humans?"

Questioner:
You often say that human consciousness is shared.
Does that mean my consciousness is not mine?

Teacher:
Your consciousness is not yours, sir.

Every human being knows fear,
knows sorrow,
knows joy,
knows loneliness,
knows desire,
knows comparison,

knows hurt.

This common structure
is the consciousness of mankind.

When you observe your consciousness,
you are observing the consciousness
of all humanity.

This brings great humility
and great compassion.

“What lies beyond consciousness?”

Questioner (softly):
If consciousness is understood completely,
if its movement ends,
what remains?

Teacher:
When the content of consciousness
is fully understood
and therefore ends,

there is a different state altogether—

not thought,
not emotion,
not memory,
not fear,
not desire.

A state untouched by time.
A state immeasurable.

One cannot describe it.
But the mind,
being free of its own structure,

is utterly silent.

In that silence
there is vastness,
immensity,
a depth that thought cannot reach.

This is not mystical.
It is the natural outcome
of complete understanding.

The Ending of the Dialogue

Teacher spoke one more time:

To observe consciousness
is to observe the whole movement of life within oneself.
When that movement is understood,
not partially but totally,
the mind becomes extraordinarily simple—

and in that simplicity
there is an intelligence that acts without conflict,
lives without fear,
and loves without attachment.

Such a mind
is the beginning of freedom.

A freedom that is not personal
but universal.

*****

To discard the false is intelligence

Sir, intelligence is not the capacity to store knowledge,
to argue cleverly,
to achieve success,
or to quote the scriptures.
That is merely memory operating within the field of conditioning.

Real intelligence is something entirely different.

Intelligence awakens
when the mind sees the false as false
and drops it instantly—
not tomorrow,
not gradually,
not through effort or discipline,
but the very moment the false is perceived.

This immediate action of perception
is intelligence.

Let us explore this carefully.

What Is the False?

The false is anything that is not rooted in actuality—
anything created by the mind as an escape,
a projection,
a belief,
a fear,
a desire.

The false includes:

- the image of oneself,
- the idea of becoming something psychologically,
- the pursuit of security in belief,
- the hope that time will solve inner problems,
- the ideal that contradicts “what is,”
- the authority of another in matters of truth,
- the sense of psychological continuity,
- all conclusions,
- all illusions created by thought.

The mind lives in the false because it seeks comfort,
and comfort is easier than truth.

Seeing the False Requires Awareness, Not Knowledge

Knowledge cannot reveal the false.

Knowledge is always of the past,
stored memory,
second hand.

To see the false,
there must be pure observation—
a seeing without motive,
without judgement,
without fear.

When the mind sees directly—
without the interference of thought—
the false stands exposed.

This exposure itself is the action of discarding.

Discarding the False Is Not a Struggle

When you clearly see a snake on the path,
you do not say,
“I must practice avoidance,”
or,
“I must gradually learn how to step aside.”

You step aside instantly.

That instant action is intelligence.

Similarly, when you see the falseness of:

- comparison,
- psychological becoming,
- dependence,
- fear sustained by thought,
- pleasure sustained by remembrance,
- authority in psychological matters,

they drop away naturally.

The seeing is the doing.

There is no conflict between the seer and the seen.

Time Cannot Discard the False

Most people say:

“I will slowly overcome fear.”
“I will one day drop jealousy.”
“I will practice compassion.”

This is the mind postponing the ending of conflict.

Time does not heal psychological illusions—

time strengthens them.

If you postpone,
you are giving continuity to the false.

Only immediate perception
ends the false.

The Mind That Clings to the False Lives in Conflict

To hold on to:

- belief,
- authority,
- an image of oneself,
- ideals,
- psychological security,

is to live in contradiction.

Because these things are not real;
they are constructs of thought.

And thought is always limited,
divisive,
fragmented.

Where the false is,
there must be conflict.

Intelligence Is the Flame That Burns the False

Intelligence is not personal.
It is not “my intelligence.”

It is a movement of clarity

that arises when the mind is free to see.

This clarity reveals:

- anger as a form of self-protection,
- fear as the movement of thought,
- desire as sensation carried into time,
- hurt as an image demanding survival,
- attachment as an escape from loneliness,
- pleasure as the continuation of memory.

When these are seen as they are,
without distortion,
they fall away.

The flame of intelligence
burns the false
without effort.

The Ending of the False Is the Beginning of the True

When the false drops away:

- fear loses its roots,
- hurt dissolves,
- comparison ends,
- desire becomes simple,
- thought understands its own place,
- the self with its endless demands becomes quiet.

In this quietness,
a new dimension of mind begins—

a clarity without centre,
a stillness without control,
a freedom that is not opposed to bondage.

The mind that discards the false
comes upon something sacred—
not created by thought—
a sense of immensity, silence, wholeness.

This is intelligence.

The Beauty of Immediate Insight

JK often said:

"Insight is the only freedom."

Insight is not analysis.
It is not gradual.
It is not produced by will.

Insight is the flash of perception
in which the mind sees the totality of something false
in one sweep.

This total perception
is the ending of that falseness.

The mind does not return to it.

To discard the false is not renunciation—
it is awakening.

So, what does it mean to say:

"To discard the false is intelligence"?

It means:

- to see clearly,

- to see wholly,
- to see without motive,
- to see without the interference of the past.

And that very seeing—
that direct perception—
is intelligence.

Intelligence is not something you cultivate.
It is something that awakens
when the mind stops clinging to what is unreal.

And the mind stops clinging
when it sees.

***

A Dialogue

"Sir, what do you mean by the false?"

Questioner:
You often say that to see the false as false
and to drop it immediately
is intelligence.
But what is the false?
Is it illusion, mistake, wrong action, ignorance?

Teacher:
The false, sir, is anything
that is not a fact—
not "what is,"
but what the mind invents
out of fear, desire, habit, and conditioning.

The false includes:

- belief as a means of security,
- ideals that contradict reality,
- psychological images we hold about ourselves,
- the authority of another in matters of truth,
- the idea of psychological becoming,
- the notion that time will change the mind,
- conclusions that freeze perception.

All this is false
because it stands in the way of seeing clearly.

To see this falseness directly
is intelligence.

“Why does the mind cling to the false?”

Questioner:
If the false creates conflict,
why does the mind hold on to it?

Teacher:
Because the mind seeks comfort, sir.
And the false is often the most comfortable.

To believe that someone protects you,
to believe you are important,
to believe that tomorrow you will be better—
these are comforting illusions.

Thought creates these illusions
because it is frightened of facing “what is.”

The false is the mind’s shelter against its own insecurity.

But a shelter built of illusion
becomes a prison.

“How do we distinguish the false from the true?”

Questioner:
If the mind is conditioned,
how can it see what is true and what is false?

Teacher:
By simple, direct observation.

You do not need a teacher,
a guru,
a philosopher,
or any authority
to tell you what is false.

You can see for yourself.

For example—

When you say,
“I hope time will heal my fear,”
is that not false?
Has fear ever ended through time?

Or when you say,
“I am important,”
“My belief is sacred,”
“My opinion must be respected”—
is that not the self-image seeking continuity?

Anything that is based on illusion,
on escape,

on distortion—
is false.

The mind sees it
when it is attentive.

“But the mind does not drop the false instantly.”

Questioner:
Even when I see something is false—
like comparison or jealousy—
it still continues.
Why is that?

Teacher:
Because you do not see it fully.
You see only part of it,
or you see it intellectually.

You say,
“Yes, jealousy is harmful,”
but the sensation of jealousy remains pleasurable,
or familiar.

Only when the mind sees the totality of falseness—
the danger of it,
the burden of it,
the ugliness of it—
only then does the false drop away instantly.

You do not struggle to drop poison
once you recognize it.

Seeing danger is enough.

That seeing is intelligence.

“Is discarding the false an act of will?”

Questioner:
Do I have to make an effort
to discard the false?
Does will play a role?

Teacher:
Where there is will,
there is conflict.

Effort implies resistance,
and resistance strengthens the very thing
you wish to overcome.

You cannot discard the false through discipline.

You discard it
because you see its falseness.

The act of discarding
is in the perception itself.

The seeing and the doing are one.

“But how can we see without distortion?”

Questioner:
Our minds are full of memories, hurts, conditioning.
Won’t these distort our perception
and prevent us from seeing the false clearly?

Teacher:

Distortion occurs only when the observer
separates himself from what he observes.

But the observer is the observed.

The hurt you examine
is the mind that is hurt.
The fear you analyse
is the mind that is afraid.

When you see this truth—
that the observer is not separate from the observed—
a tremendous clarity emerges.

In that clarity,
perception is not distorted.

And what is false
is seen without confusion.

“Does intelligence come only after discarding the false?”

Questioner:
So, intelligence appears only when the false is gone?

Teacher:
No, sir.

Intelligence is the act of discarding.

The very seeing of the false
is intelligence.

Not something you develop,
not something you acquire.

It is there
when the mind is quiet enough
to see clearly.

Intelligence is not knowledge.
It is not cleverness.
It is not the ability to argue.

It is the clarity of perception
that acts instantly.

“What happens when the false ends?”

Questioner (softly):
If the false ends—
belief, fear, image, comparison—
what remains?

Teacher:
What remains is a mind
that is fresh, innocent, unburdened.

A mind that sees directly,
without the contamination of yesterday.

This mind has space—
immense space.

In that space
there is silence.
Not cultivated silence,
but the natural silence
that comes when conflict ends.

And in that silence
there is intelligence,
a sense of tremendous compassion,
a sensitivity that is extraordinarily alive.

This is the beginning of true understanding.

“Is truth then discovered in this intelligence?”

Teacher:
Truth cannot be sought.

But when the false is gone,
truth reveals itself.

The mind that is free
from illusion, fear, and conditioning
does not search—
it sees.

Truth is not something far away.
It is what remains
when the false drops away.

Closing Silence

Teacher spoke gently:

To discard the false
is not asceticism,
not renunciation.
It is the simple act
of seeing clearly.

And clarity is compassion.

Clarity is intelligence.

When the false is gone—
and it goes only through insight—
the mind is free.

A free mind
is the most beautiful thing on earth.

It is the beginning
and the ending
of all transformation.

The evening deepened into silence.

No one moved.
It was enough to sit quietly
in the presence of that insight.

*****

See Without ‘Me’

Sir, to “see without me” is one of the most profound statements in all of Krishnamurti’s teaching.
It points to a radical transformation in the quality of perception.

Ordinarily, we do not see.
We interpret.
We judge.
We react.
We compare.
We translate everything into the language of the past.

This interference of the “me”—
the centre of memory, fear, desire, conclusion—
distorts perception.

To see without “me”
is to see without distortion.

Let us go into this very carefully.

What Is the “Me”?

The “me” is not a mysterious spiritual entity.
It is a movement of thought.

The “me” is:

- the image I have built about myself,
- my memories of pleasure and hurt,
- my ambitions,
- my fears,
- my beliefs,

- my experiences,
- my opinions,
- the sense of continuity created by thought.

This entire psychological structure
is what we call “me.”

It is the past—
the known.

And the past inevitably distorts the present.

The ‘Me’ Stands Between the Mind and What Is Seen

When I look at a tree,
I do not actually see the tree.
I see the word “tree,”
the memories of trees,
the knowledge associated with it.

When I look at my wife, husband, friend, child,
I see the image I have built of them—
years of memory, pleasure, hurt, expectation.

When I look at myself,
I see the images I cling to.

Therefore, the “me” interferes with all perception.

Where the “me” is active,
there is never direct seeing.

Seeing Without ‘Me’ Is Pure Perception

To “see without me”

is to see without:

- naming,
- judging,
- comparing,
- condemning,
- justifying,
- interpreting,
- projecting,
- wishing,
- fearing.

It is to allow perception to be clean,
uncontaminated by memory.

It is to see with eyes that are fresh,
with a mind that is not burdened.

In such seeing,
there is no observer separate from the observed.

The observer is the past.
When the past is quiet,
there is only the thing being seen.

That is pure perception.

Seeing Without 'Me' Is Seeing Reality

The "me" lives in illusion—
in images, beliefs, fears, conclusions.

When the "me" is absent,
you see what actually is:

- the fact of fear,
- the fact of loneliness,

- the fact of hurt,
- the fact of desire,
- the fact of sorrow.

You see without distortion,
without escape.

Seeing the fact as fact
is the beginning of intelligence.

The Ending of the 'Me' Is Not an Act of Will

You cannot force the "me" to be silent.

Effort strengthens the "me."

The "me" ends
only when you see its entire structure—
its movement,
its motives,
its reactions,
its fears,
its desires.

When this whole movement is seen
as one movement,
without choice,
without judgement,
without resistance—

it naturally becomes quiet.

In that quietness,
there is freedom from the "me."

Seeing Without 'Me' Is Also Listening Without 'Me'

To truly listen
is to listen without the interference of memory.

To listen without "me" is:

- to listen without defensiveness,
- to listen without interpreting,
- to listen without preparing your response,
- to listen without hurt or flattery.

In such listening,
the mind is extraordinarily sensitive,
alert,
present.

This listening is love.

Because love exists only where the "me" is absent.

Seeing Without 'Me' Is the Ending of Conflict

All conflict is the struggle of the "me":

- "I must be something,"
- "I must not fail,"
- "I must be secure,"
- "I must be recognized,"
- "I must overcome fear,"
- "I must find enlightenment."

This inward tension
is the very essence of the "me."

When the "me" is not there,
there is no contradiction.

There is simplicity.

There is clarity.

There is peace.

Seeing Without 'Me' Is the Beginning of Freedom

When the "me" is absent,
the mind is:

- quiet without control,
- attentive without effort,
- intelligent without accumulation,
- compassionate without sentiment,
- free without escape.

This freedom is not a goal.
It is the natural state of a mind
that sees without distortion.

The Miracle of Pure Seeing

To "see without me"
is to touch a different dimension of existence.

A dimension where:

- the mind is completely still,
- thought knows its place,
- awareness is total,
- there is no centre from which you see,
- there is only seeing.

This seeing is sacred—
for it is untouched by time.

It is the seeing of truth.

And truth transforms.

So, what does it mean to ‘see without me’?

It means:

- to see without the past interfering,
- to see without the observer,
- to see without fear or desire shaping perception,
- to see with complete attention,
- to see what is, as it is.

Such seeing is intelligence.
Such seeing is love.
Such seeing is freedom.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, is it truly possible to see without the ‘me’?”

Questioner:
You often say that one must look at life,
at nature,
at oneself,
without the interference of the “me.”
But is this actually possible?
The “me” seems to be present in everything.

Teacher:
Sir, the “me” is present
because we have never questioned its existence.

We have accepted it as natural, inevitable.

To see without the “me”
is not a matter of belief,
but of understanding what the “me” is.

If we can look into this together,
very simply,
perhaps we will discover something extraordinary.

“Then, what exactly is this ‘me’?”

Questioner:
Please help me understand.
What is the structure of this “me”?

Teacher:
The “me” is a movement of thought.

It is made of:

- memory,
- experience,
- hurt,
- pleasure,
- desire,
- fear,
- conclusions,
- beliefs,
- the image one has about oneself,
- the image one has about others.

This whole structure,
accumulated over time,
is what we call “me.”

It is a bundle of memories—
a centre created by thought.

“But this ‘me’ feels very real.”

Questioner:
Even if it is made of thought,
it feels so strong,
so solid.
How can something so powerful be merely an image?

Teacher:
Thought has given it solidity.

You repeat,
“This is me,
my house,
my talent,
my suffering,
my achievement.”

The repetition gives strength
to something that is essentially memory.

When you look carefully,
you will see the “me” has no independent existence.
It exists only as a movement in thought.

When thought is quiet,
the “me” is not.

“How does the ‘me’ interfere with seeing?”

Questioner:
You say we never see anything directly

because the “me” distorts perception.
How does this distortion happen?

Teacher:
Simple, sir.

When you look at a tree
and immediately call it “tree,”
the word stands between you and the thing.

When you look at your wife or husband,
you see not the person
but the image you have built—
years of memory, pleasure, hurt.

When you look at yourself,
you see your conclusions—
“I am this,”
“I am that,”
“I must become something.”

This constant interference
prevents direct perception.

The “me” is like dust on the lens of a camera.
Everything is blurred.

“Can the mind observe without the observer?”

Questioner:
But observation seems to require an observer.
If there is no ‘me,’
who is watching?

Teacher:

That is precisely the illusion.

The observer is part of the observed.

The anger you observe
and the "you" who says, "I am angry"—
both arise from the same source.

The observer is simply another fragment of thought
pretending to be separate.

When you see that the observer is the observed,
the division ends.

And when division ends,
observation becomes complete.

There is only seeing—
not "I am seeing."

"If I try to remove the 'me', it becomes stronger."

Questioner:
Whenever I attempt to quiet the 'me,'
it comes back even more strongly.
Why is this?

Teacher:
Because the very effort to remove the 'me'
is made by the 'me'.

The 'me' says:

- "I must control my thoughts."
- "I must become silent."
- "I must get rid of my ego."

All this is the activity of the same centre.

You cannot remove the shadow
by wrestling with it.

The ‘me’ ends
when you understand it,
not when you fight it.

Understanding comes from seeing,
not from effort.

“So how do we see without the ‘me’?”

Questioner:
If effort cannot end the ‘me,’
what then can we do?
How do we learn to see without it?

Teacher:
Sir, first see the total movement of the “me”
without choosing,
without judging,
without condemning.

Just watch it—
its reactions,
its fears,
its desires,
its defences.

In that watching,
the mind becomes extraordinarily quiet,
not forced,

but naturally quiet
because it is learning.

In that quietness,
the “me” is absent.

Then there is pure seeing.

“Is this seeing related to love?”

Questioner:
Sometimes you say love exists only when the ‘me’ is not.
Is seeing without the ‘me’ connected with love?

Teacher:
Of course.

Where the “me” is—
with its demands, attachments, fears, images—
love cannot be.

To see without the ‘me’
is to listen without the ‘me,’
to touch without the ‘me,’
to relate without the ‘me.’

In such seeing,
there is sensitivity, affection, compassion.

Love is not an emotion.
Love is a state in which the self is absent.

“Is this state of seeing permanent?”

Questioner:

If one sees without the ‘me,’
does that state remain?

Teacher:
Sir, the moment you want it to remain,
the “me” has entered again.

Permanence is the desire of the self.

Seeing without the ‘me’
is not a state to be preserved.

It is a living thing,
happening moment to moment
as the mind is attentive.

Attention has no continuity.
It is always fresh.

“What is the significance of seeing without the ‘me’?”

Questioner (softly):
If one truly sees without the ‘me,’
what happens to life?

Teacher:
Life becomes simple,
clear,
unburdened.

There is no conflict,
because conflict exists only
when the ‘me’ struggles to become something.

There is no fear,

because fear arises from the self's demand for continuity.

There is no loneliness,
because loneliness is the craving of the self for recognition.

Seeing without the 'me'
is the beginning of true freedom.

Not the freedom to do what one wishes,
but freedom from the very structure of the self.

The Dialogue Ends in Silence

Teacher spoke finally:

To see without the 'me'
is the greatest intelligence.
It is the flame that cleanses the mind.
It is the beginning of compassion.
It is the essence of meditation.

When the 'me' is not,
the mind is vast, silent,
and astonishingly alive.

In that silence,
truth reveals itself.

The dialogue faded into a silence
deeper than words.

*****

Thought Is Ever Limited

Sir, one of Krishnamurti's most revolutionary insights is that thought, by its very nature, is limited—
limited in its scope,
limited in its function,
limited in its ability to comprehend the whole of life.

This is not a philosophical claim.
It is a fact, observable by anyone who looks into the movement of their own mind.

Let us examine this with great clarity.

Thought Is the Response of Memory

Thought is born out of memory.
Memory is the residue of experience—
what has been known, recorded, stored.

Therefore:

Thought can only function within the field of the known.

It cannot step into the unknown,
because it has no reference,
no content,
no movement there.

Thought is always old,
never fresh.

Even when it imagines the future,
it is projecting from the past.

Thus, thought is inherently limited.

Thought Can Only Operate Through Images and Words

Thought works by forming:

- images,
- symbols,
- ideas,
- names,
- conclusions.

These representations are never the thing itself.

The word “tree” is not the tree.
The image of your wife is not your wife.
The idea of yourself is not yourself.
The concept of God is not the immeasurable.

So thought always deals with representations,
not actuality.

A representation is partial,
fragmentary.

Therefore, thought is fragmentary.

A Fragment Cannot Understand the Whole

Because thought moves in fragments,
it cannot comprehend the totality of life.

Thought can organise, plan, calculate.
It can build bridges, hospitals, space rockets.

But thought cannot understand:

- love,
- beauty,
- silence,
- death,
- fear in its entirety,
- sorrow at its depth,
- the nature of the mind,
- the vastness of existence.

These require a different kind of perception—
not thought,
but insight.

Thought can describe love,
but the description is not love.

Thought can discuss truth,
but the words are not truth.

The moment the mind sees this,
there is great humility.

Because Thought Is Limited, It Creates Conflict

Thought functions from a centre—
the "me,"
the ego,
the self-image.

This centre is itself a product of thought.

From this centre, thought operates as:

- "my desire,"
- "my fear,"

- “my belief,”
- “my experience.”

This creates division:

me vs. you,
order vs. disorder,
what is vs. what should be.

Where there is division,
there must be conflict.

Thus, thought inevitably produces conflict.

Even the noble thoughts—
about God, virtue, salvation—
remain within the field of fragmentation
and therefore, create division.

Thought Tries to Capture the Whole and Fails

Thought attempts to understand the immeasurable
by creating beliefs, theories, philosophies.

But belief is a projection of fear or desire.
Philosophy is merely the arrangement of thought.
Theories are the extension of past knowledge.

All these arise from thought’s limitation.

This is why human beings have lived in illusions—
national, religious, ideological.

These illusions divide mankind.

The recognition of thought's limits
is the ending of illusion.

Thought Cannot Bring Psychological Security

Thought tries endlessly to create security:

- through belief,
- through habit,
- through relationship,
- through identification,
- through possession,
- through tradition.

But thought itself is impermanent—
changing, uncertain, restless.

How can something impermanent
create permanence?

So, all psychological security created by thought
is unstable.

This instability breeds fear.

Thus, fear is rooted in thought.

When the Mind Sees the Limitation of Thought, It Becomes Quiet

Seeing the limitation of thought
is not a matter of accepting a theory.

It is a direct perception.

The moment you see
that thought cannot touch the whole,

cannot end sorrow,
cannot bring peace,
cannot see truth—

thought naturally becomes quiet.

Not suppressed,
not controlled,
but quiet.

It knows its own limitation
and therefore, remains in its proper place.

This quietness is the beginning of intelligence.

Intelligence Is Not Thought

Intelligence arises from insight—
from a seeing that is instantaneous,
not derived from memory.

Insight comes when the mind is:

- attentive,
- quiet,
- free from the "me,"
- free from conflict.

This intelligence is holistic.
It is compassionate.
It is creative.
It is free of fear.

Thought cannot produce intelligence—
but intelligence can guide thought.

The Beauty of Understanding Thought's Limit

Understanding that thought is limited

is the flowering of humility.

You no longer seek certainty from thought.
You no longer depend on belief.
You no longer cling to images.
You no longer fight to protect psychological structures.

This freedom is not the result of effort.
It arises from clear seeing.

A mind that sees is free.

A mind that sees is intelligent.

A mind that sees is unburdened.

So, what does it mean that "thought is ever limited"?

It means:

- thought is a product of the past,
- it cannot see the whole,
- it functions through images and symbols,
- it divides and therefore creates conflict,
- it cannot touch truth or love,
- it cannot end fear or sorrow,
- it cannot bring psychological security,
- it must operate in its right place and no further.

To see this clearly
is the beginning of meditation—
the beginning of a mind that is free.

***

A Dialogue

"Sir, you said thought is always limited. Why?"

Questioner:
You often say that thought is limited
and therefore, cannot bring clarity or freedom.
But thought is so powerful—
it builds bridges, performs surgeries,
sends rockets to space.
Why do you call it limited?

Teacher:
Thought is indeed powerful, sir,
but its power exists only within a narrow field.

Thought comes from memory.
Memory is the residue of experience.
Experience is always partial.

Therefore, thought—being the response of memory—
is ever limited.

Thought cannot escape its own foundation in the past.

"But thought helps us solve many problems."

Questioner:
If thought is limited,
why is it so effective in practical matters?

Teacher:
Thought is marvellous in the technical world—
in engineering, medicine, science.

There it must function,
and function efficiently.

But thought becomes dangerous
when it tries to solve psychological problems:

- fear,
- loneliness,
- jealousy,
- sorrow,
- the search for meaning,
- the desire for security.

Thought can work with machines,
but it cannot heal the human heart.

The same tool cannot be used for every purpose.

“Why can’t thought solve inner problems?”

Questioner:
Why does thought fail in the psychological field?

Teacher:
Because thought itself is the source of many of those problems.

For example:

Thought remembers pleasure
and demands its continuation—
but pleasure cannot be continuous,
so thought creates frustration.

Thought remembers hurt
and carries it as an image—
and that image breeds fear, anger, resentment.

Thought imagines the future

and creates anxiety.

Thought tries to control fear,
not seeing it is fear.

Thus, thought attempting to end psychological suffering
is like fire trying to extinguish fire.

“What exactly limits thought?”

Questioner:
Is thought limited because it is conditioned?

Teacher:
Conditioning is part of it.

Thought operates only within the known—
what it has accumulated:

- culture,
- experience,
- education,
- belief,
- memory.

It cannot go beyond itself.

Even when it imagines the infinite,
it is projecting its own limited content.

A finite thing cannot touch the infinite.

“But thought seems to operate continuously. Can it stop?”

Questioner:

The mind is always thinking.
Can thought stop?

Teacher:
Thought cannot stop by will or discipline.
That would be another movement of thought.

Thought quiets naturally
when it realizes its own limitation.

When you understand that thought cannot understand love,
cannot end fear,
cannot bring inner security—
thought becomes silent.

Not suppressed,
but quiet because it sees the truth about itself.

This seeing is intelligence.

“Does thought create the ‘me’?”

Questioner:
Is the sense of self—of ‘me’—created by thought?

Teacher:
Of course.

The “me” is:

- your name,
- your form,
- your memories,
- your beliefs,
- your achievements,
- your hurts,

- your ambitions.

All this is put together by thought.

The “me” is a bundle of memories—
a movement of thought seeking continuity.

Because the “me” is limited,
it creates division—
between you and another,
between what is and what should be.

Where there is division,
there must be conflict.

“If thought is limited, what is intelligence?”

Questioner:
Then what is intelligence?
Is it different from thought?

Teacher:
Completely different.

Intelligence is not knowledge.
Intelligence is insight—
a direct perception of what is true and what is false.

Insight is instantaneous.

It is not the result of thought.

When the mind sees the limitation of thought totally,
not intellectually but actually,
that very seeing is intelligence.

Thought cannot generate that intelligence.
But intelligence can guide thought.

“Can thought and intelligence operate together?”

Questioner:
Can thought and intelligence coexist?
Or must thought cease entirely?

Teacher:
Thought has its rightful place—
in the practical world.

But in the psychological world,
thought must be silent
for intelligence to act.

When intelligence is awake,
thought becomes its servant
—not its master.

Then thought is beautifully precise,
efficient,
free of confusion.

Thought is limited,
but intelligence is limitless in its clarity.

“Is the realization of thought’s limitation transformative?”

Questioner:
If one truly sees that thought is limited,
does something change inwardly?

Teacher:
Naturally.

When the mind sees the fact—
not as an idea—
that thought cannot bring order inwardly,
cannot create understanding,
cannot touch the depth of life,
the mind stops seeking answers through thought.

In that very moment,
the mind becomes quiet.

This quietness is not cultivated.
It is the quietness of understanding.

In that stillness,
there is freedom from the known.

A new quality of mind begins—
sensitive, spacious, aware.

“What lies beyond the limits of thought?”

Questioner (softly):
If thought ends,
what remains?

Teacher:
What remains is not something mysterious.

It is a state of wholeness—
a mind that is clear,
without conflict,
without fear,
without the noise of becoming.

Such a mind is extraordinarily alive.

In that silence,
there is a sense of immensity
that thought can never touch.

One does not name it.
One does not pursue it.

It comes when thought has understood its own limits.

The Dialogue Ends in Quietness

Teacher finally said:

When the mind sees clearly
that thought is ever limited,
that it cannot reach the whole,
cannot heal sorrow,
cannot touch love—
then thought naturally becomes quiet.

In that quietness,
there is intelligence.
In that intelligence,
there is freedom.
And in that freedom,
there is the immense beauty of life
unfolding without the distortion of the self.

Silence filled the air—
a silence deeper than words.

*****

“Goodness Is Unrelated to Evil”

Sir, we usually think in opposites.
We assume goodness is the opposite of evil—
that where evil ends, goodness begins.
This is the conditioning of centuries.

But Krishnamurti points to something far more radical:

Goodness has no relationship with evil.

Goodness does not arise out of the ending of evil.

Goodness is not the opposite of evil.

Let us explore this carefully, step by step.

Opposites Are Always Connected

The opposite of anger is calmness.
But calmness is still conditioned by anger—
it is born out of the desire not to be angry.

The opposite of fear is courage.
But courage is often fear trying to overcome itself.

The opposite of greed is austerity.
But austerity may simply be greed in disguise,
seeking moral reward or spiritual status.

Where there is an opposite,
there is psychological continuity.

Thus:

Evil and its opposite—so-called goodness—are two ends of the same movement.

They share the same root.

That which has an opposite is still within the field of duality,
within the field of conflict.

Goodness Is Not the Product of Struggle

Most religions and moral systems teach goodness through:

- control,
- discipline,
- suppression,
- obedience,
- imitation,
- conformity to a pattern.

But anything born from fear or discipline
cannot be goodness.

It is merely the result of conditioning.

Where there is motive—
"I must be good,"
"I must avoid evil,"
"I should live morally"—
there is no goodness.

Goodness is not born from effort.

Evil Is the Movement of the Self

Evil, in the psychological sense,
is the assertion of the “me,”
the centre that:

- isolates,
- compares,
- competes,
- dominates,
- envies,
- seeks power,
- creates division,
- generates violence through fear and desire.

This movement of the self
produces cruelty,
corruption,
decline of compassion.

Where the “me” operates,
evil begins.

Goodness Is the Absence of the Self

Goodness is not the reform of the “me.”
It is not the self becoming kind, becoming virtuous.

Goodness is the ending of the self.

When the centre dissolves—
when fear, ambition, comparison, and hurt are understood—
the mind becomes astonishingly simple,
quiet,
sensitive.

In that silence of the self,
there is compassion.

Compassion is goodness.

Goodness is not personal virtue.
Goodness is not character.
Goodness is not reputation.

Goodness is a state of being
in which the “me” is absent.

Goodness Cannot Be Cultivated

Anything cultivated is the result of will.
Will is the movement of the self.

Therefore:

- cultivated humility is pride,
- cultivated love is attachment,
- cultivated compassion is sentiment,
- cultivated goodness is hypocrisy.

True goodness blooms without motive.

It is like a flower growing in sunlight—
not striving,
not practicing,
not becoming.

Goodness arises naturally
when the false ends.

Goodness Is Not the Opposite of Evil Because It Has No Opposite

Evil is born out of the fragmentation of the mind.

Goodness has no fragmentation—
it is wholeness.

Anything that has an opposite
exists only in duality.

But goodness exists outside duality.
It is not the reaction to evil,
not the conquest of evil,
not the purification of evil.

It simply is.

And because it has no opposite,
it is beyond conflict.

Goodness is not in contradiction.
Evil always is.

Goodness is not the opposite pole of evil—
it is a different dimension of mind
altogether.

When You Understand Evil Completely, Goodness Flowers

Understanding evil
is not fighting it.

It is seeing:

- the movement of fear,
- the nature of desire,
- the structure of thought,
- the illusion of the self,
- the violence born of comparison,

- the separative action of belief and ideology.

When this whole movement is seen
as one structure—
not in fragments—
it ends.

And when the false ends,
the true flowers.

Goodness is that flowering.

It is the flame that remains
when the smoke of illusion is gone.

Goodness Is Innocence

Goodness is not morality.
Morality is socially manufactured.
Goodness is not virtue.
Virtue belongs to culture.

Goodness is innocence.

Innocence is a mind
that has seen the whole movement of corruption
within itself
and is free of it.

Such a mind is not trying to be noble.
It simply has no place for evil.

Not because it opposes it,
but because it sees through it entirely.

Seeing through illusion
is intelligence.

Intelligence is goodness.

So, what does it truly mean:

“Goodness is unrelated to evil”

It means:

- goodness is not the opposite of evil,
- goodness does not arise by conquering evil,
- goodness is not shaped by society, religion, or discipline,
- goodness is entirely outside the field of duality,
- goodness appears when the self ends,
- goodness is compassion,
- goodness is intelligence,
- goodness is a state of wholeness,
- goodness cannot be cultivated,
- goodness is timeless, effortless.

And because goodness stands alone—
complete in itself—
it has no relationship with evil.

Goodness is like sunlight.
Its existence does not depend on darkness.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, is goodness the opposite of evil?”

Questioner:

For centuries, moralists, religions, and philosophers
have said we must fight evil
and cultivate goodness.
They treat the two as opposites—
light versus darkness,
virtue versus sin.
Do you agree with this traditional view?

Teacher:
Sir, the opposite is always related to that which it opposes.
Courage is born out of fear.
Humility is cultivated out of vanity.
Non-violence is often violence seeking respectability.

The opposite contains the seed of its opposite.

So, goodness,
if it is merely the opposite of evil,
is not goodness at all.

It is still within the field of conflict.

Goodness is not the other side of evil.
Goodness is unrelated to evil.

“But why do we think goodness is the opposite of evil?”

Questioner:
It seems natural to think in opposites.
If hatred is evil, then love must be its opposite.
If cruelty is evil, kindness must be good.
Why do you say they are not opposites?

Teacher:
Because what you call goodness

is often merely a reaction.

You are cruel one day,
and next day you feel remorse
and try to be kind.
The kindness is born out of cruelty.

It carries the imprint of yesterday.

Or you feel afraid,
and out of fear you imitate courage.
But courage is then simply fear wearing a new mask.

An action born out of its opposite
is still tied to the root of the opposite.

The opposite strengthens what it opposes.

This is the tragedy of moral instruction.

“So, goodness cannot arise from fighting evil?”

Questioner:
Are you saying that we cannot overcome evil
through discipline, control, or moral struggle?

Teacher:
Exactly.

The moment you struggle to overcome evil,
you give reality to evil.

If you resist anger,
anger becomes stronger.
If you suppress jealousy,

it finds new ways to appear.
If you fight hatred,
your struggle itself is a form of hatred.

Goodness does not come through conflict.

Goodness blooms only when conflict ends.

“Then what is evil?”

Questioner:
If goodness is unrelated to evil,
then what is evil?
How do we understand its nature?

Teacher:
Evil is the movement of the self—
the “me.”

The “me” isolates.
It says, “This is mine, that is yours.”
It compares, judges, competes.
It wants power, recognition, success.
It lives in fear and desire.

This movement of the self
creates violence, corruption, cruelty.

Where the “me” is active,
in subtle or gross ways,
there is evil.

Evil is not something satanic or metaphysical.
It is the action of the self that divides and hurts.

“Then what is goodness?”

Questioner:
If goodness has nothing to do with fighting evil,
what is goodness in itself?

Teacher:
Goodness is the absence of the self.

Goodness is the ending of the “me”
with all its images, wounds, ambitions, fears.

When the self is not,
there is an extraordinary sense of compassion,
a sensitivity that is not sentimental.

Goodness is not the practice of virtue,
not moral behaviour dictated by society.

Goodness is a state of being
in which the mind is free from conflict,
from division,
from fear.

It is like a flower that blooms in the sunlight—
not because it tries to be beautiful,
but because there is no hindrance.

“Can goodness be cultivated?”

Questioner:
Most religions tell us to cultivate goodness
through prayer, meditation, discipline.
Can goodness really be cultivated?

Teacher:
Anything cultivated through effort
is the projection of thought.

Thought says,
"I must be kind,"
"I must evolve,"
"I must perfect myself."

Such cultivation is merely the self
seeking a more refined image.

A practiced goodness
is not goodness.

Goodness cannot be cultivated.
It can only flower
in the absence of the false.

"Then how does goodness arise?"

Questioner:
If we cannot practice or cultivate goodness,
how does it arise?

Teacher:
Goodness arises
when the mind sees the false as false
and the true as true.

When you see the danger of fear,
fear ends.
When you see the falseness of comparison,
comparison drops away.
When you see the poison of ambition,

ambition ceases.

In the ending of the false,
the true appears.

Goodness is not added to the mind.
It is uncovered
when illusion ends.

“Is goodness related to love?”

Questioner:
You speak of goodness as compassion, sensitivity.
Is it the same as love?

Teacher:
Where love is, goodness is.
But love is not the sentimentality of the self.

Love is not attachment,
not dependency,
not desire.

Love is the ending of the self.

In that ending,
there is warmth, care, affection,
a quality of attention that has no motive.

Love and goodness are not separate.
Both exist only when the “me” is absent.

“If goodness is unrelated to evil, what is its place in human life?”

Questioner (softly):
If goodness is never in opposition to evil,
never born of struggle,
never the product of will—
what is its significance in daily living?

Teacher:
Goodness gives order to daily life—
an order that is not imposed,
but flows naturally from clarity.

Goodness brings sensitivity—
to nature, to people, to oneself.

Goodness brings justice—
not the justice of law,
but the justice of compassion.

Goodness brings humility—
not cultivated modesty,
but freedom from the self.

And goodness brings peace—
a peace that is not the opposite of conflict,
but the absence of conflict.

This peace has a quality of sacredness.

The Dialogue Ends in Silence

Teacher Spoke gently:

Goodness is not something to be attained.
It is not the reward for virtue,
nor the result of discipline.

Goodness comes into being
when the mind sees the nature of evil
and steps out of its shadow.

When the self ends,
goodness flowers.

This flower has no opposite.
It blooms in freedom.

The group sat without movement.
They were listening with a depth
that only stillness allows.

*****

Silence of Emptiness

Sir, when we hear the word “emptiness,”
we immediately associate it with loneliness,
with nothingness,
with a void we fear.

But there is a totally different emptiness—
not the emptiness of despair,
not the emptiness created by loss,
not the emptiness of isolation—
but an emptiness that is full,
alive,
immense.

This emptiness is not a lack.
It is the ending of all that is burdening the mind.

Let us look into this carefully.

The Ordinary Emptiness We Know

There is the emptiness of:

- loneliness,
- unfulfilled desire,
- disappointment,
- the ache of isolation,
- the boredom of repetition,
- the sorrow of not being loved,
- the emptiness of a life built around ambition.

This emptiness is the shadow of the self.

It is born of thought

and sustained by thought.

It is a painful emptiness
and the mind runs from it—
into activity,
into entertainment,
into belief,
into relationship,
into ideals,
into the pursuit of knowledge.

But this running only deepens the emptiness.

The Emptiness Krishnamurti Speaks of Is Different

The emptiness of which JK speaks
is not born of sorrow or lack.

It is the emptiness that comes
when the mind has understood itself completely
and is free of:

- fear,
- hurt,
- ambition,
- comparison,
- envy,
- becoming,
- psychological accumulation.

When the mind has dropped all the things
that clutter and cloud its clarity,
what remains is emptiness.

This emptiness is not created.
It is revealed

when the false ends.

The Silence of Emptiness Is Not Manufactured

You cannot make the mind empty.
You cannot force silence.

Any deliberate attempt to create emptiness
is merely thought rearranging itself.

Thought says:

- "I must be silent."
- "I must meditate."
- "I must control my mind."

This is noise.
This is conflict.
This is the activity of the "me."

True emptiness appears
only when the "me" ends.

Emptiness Is Freedom from the Known

The mind is always full:

- full of memory,
- full of images,
- full of fear,
- full of belief,
- full of conclusions.

This fullness leaves no space for the new.

The silence of emptiness
is the silence of a mind

that is not burdened by the past.

It is a silence that is spacious,
deep,
alive.

It is the silence of freedom.

Emptiness Is Not Void: It Is Vastness

Thought believes emptiness is void,
a dark hole.

But the emptiness of which we speak
is the clearing of the cluttered mind.

It is an emptiness that contains:

- the intensity of attention,
- the fragrance of compassion,
- the luminosity of clarity,
- the stillness of a mind beyond measure.

It is like the space around a star—
empty yet full of energy.

It is like the space in which sound appears—
silent yet alive.

This emptiness is a living silence.

In This Emptiness, Thought Has Its Right Place

In this emptiness,
thought does not dominate.
It becomes quiet, respectful, precise—

used only for practical matters.

Thought no longer spills into the psychological field,
creating noise and confusion.

Thought is silent
not because it is suppressed
but because it sees its own limitation.

In that silence,
there is intelligence.

Emptiness Is the Beginning of Love

When the mind is empty—
empty of hurt,
empty of fear,
empty of images—
there is space for love.

Love cannot exist where the self is crowded.
Love cannot exist where memory interferes.
Love cannot exist where desire is worshipped.

The silence of emptiness
is the cradle of love.

Emptiness Is the Door to the Sacred

When the mind is truly empty—
not through practice,
not through discipline,
not through meditation techniques—
it comes upon a quality
that is not of time.

It comes upon:

- a vast stillness,
- a sense of immensity,
- a mysterious depth,
- a sacredness that cannot be named.

This sacredness is not the invention of thought.
It is not found in scriptures.
It cannot be worshipped.

It is encountered only
in the silence of a mind
that is utterly empty.

So, what is the ‘Silence of Emptiness’?

It is:

- the silence when the self ends,
- the emptiness when the past ceases to dominate,
- the space in which clarity flowers,
- the quietness that is not cultivated,
- the vastness beyond the noise of thought,
- the ground of compassion,
- the doorway to the sacred.

It is a silence that is not the opposite of noise.
It is a silence beyond opposites.

It is a silence that is infinite.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, what do you mean by the ‘silence of emptiness’?”

Questioner:
You often refer to emptiness—
an emptiness that has silence,
and a silence that has great depth.
But emptiness usually frightens us.
We feel lonely, isolated, hollow.
Is this the emptiness you speak of?

Teacher:
Not at all, sir.

The emptiness that breeds loneliness,
boredom, sorrow,
is the emptiness created by the self—
the emptiness of a life centred on becoming,
on ambition,
on fear,
on endless pursuits.

That emptiness is full of the noise of the "me."

But there is a totally different emptiness—
an emptiness that is vast,
untouched by fear,
filled with the perfume of silence.

Let us inquire into that.

"Why do we fear emptiness?"

Questioner:
Whenever I feel empty,
I immediately reach for something—
a book, conversation, entertainment, a belief.

Why is emptiness so frightening?

Teacher:
Because emptiness exposes the self.

In moments of stillness
you meet yourself as you are—
your wounds,
your loneliness,
your fears,
your unfulfilled desires.

The self does not want to be seen.
So, it escapes into activity,
into knowledge,
into ideals,
into religion,
into relationship,
into the future.

Emptiness threatens the continuity of the self.

Therefore, the mind flees from it.

"Is the emptiness created by the self real emptiness?"

Questioner:
So that painful emptiness—
the emptiness of loneliness—
is not the emptiness you mean?

Teacher:
No, sir.

That emptiness is the full weight of the self.

It is the emptiness that arises
when the self pursues fulfilment
and finds it cannot be fulfilled.

That is not emptiness.
It is the despair of the self.

The emptiness I speak of
comes when the self ends.

“How does the self end?”

Questioner:
You say the silence of emptiness appears
when the self ends.
But how does the self end?

Teacher:
The self ends when its whole movement is seen clearly—

the movement of comparison,
of becoming,
of seeking recognition,
of fear,
of desire,
of psychological accumulation.

To see this movement as a single process—
not in fragments—
is the ending of the self.

The perception is the ending.

Not discipline,
not will,

not effort.

Understanding ends the self.

“Does this understanding come gradually?”

Questioner:
Do we have to observe and understand ourselves slowly,
over time?

Teacher:
Time does not reveal truth.

If you give time to ending fear,
you are giving fear continuity.

If you say, “I will gradually understand myself,”
you are postponing clarity.

See the whole movement of the self instantly—
in a flash.
That flash is insight.

And in insight, the false ends.

“What remains when the self ends?”

Questioner:
If the self ends,
is there not nothingness?
A sort of void?

Teacher:
Yes, there is an emptiness—
but it is not a void.

It is an emptiness filled with extraordinary vitality.

It is emptiness because it is free—
free of fear,
free of hurt,
free of ambition,
free of becoming.

It is empty of the psychological content
that burdens the mind.

But this emptiness is full of:

- clarity,
- sensitivity,
- compassion,
- immense silence.

It is empty of the self,
and therefore, full of life.

"What is the silence of this emptiness?"

Questioner:
You call this state the "silence of emptiness."
What is this silence?

Teacher:
It is not the silence between two noises.
It is not the silence of the mind trying to be silent.

It is the silence that comes
when thought understands its own limitation
and becomes quiet naturally.

In this silence

there is no centre from which you listen.
No observer.
No experiencer.

Only silence—
boundless,
alive.

It is the silence in which the mind meets the infinite.

“Is this silence the result of meditation?”

Questioner:
Can meditation bring this silence?
If I sit quietly, breathe, watch my thoughts—
will this emptiness come?

Teacher:
Any method,
any practice,
is mechanical.

A mechanical mind cannot enter silence.

If you practise silence,
you are merely repeating a pattern—
and repetition is noise.

True meditation
is the ending of the self.

When the self ends,
the mind naturally falls into deep, effortless silence.

This silence cannot be cultivated.

It comes when the mind is free.

“Does this silence have intelligence?”

Questioner:
Is this silence merely a state of calmness,
or is there intelligence in it?

Teacher:
It is the highest form of intelligence.

Because in this silence,
the mind is utterly attentive.
There is no distortion,
no conflict,
no fear.

The silence of emptiness
is a silence that listens,
sees,
acts.

It is not passive.
It is full of energy.

In this silence,
compassion flowers.

And where there is compassion,
there is intelligence.

“Can this silence act in daily life?”

Questioner:

Does this emptiness and silence
have any place in ordinary living—
in relationships, work, conflict?

Teacher:
Of course.

A mind that is empty of the self
is a mind that does not hurt or get hurt.
It listens without the distortion of its own conclusions.
It acts without conflict.
It loves without dependency.

From the silence of emptiness
flows clarity in action.

One begins to live without fear,
without comparison,
without the ache of loneliness.

One lives simply,
and therefore profoundly.

The End of the Dialogue

Teacher's voice grew softer:

The silence of emptiness
is the silence of a mind
that is free from the burden of itself.

It is emptiness without fear.
Silence without effort.
Stillness without control.

It is in this silence
that the immeasurable comes into being.

One cannot seek it.
One cannot practise it.
One can only understand the noise—
and in the understanding,
the noise ends.

Then the mind is empty.
And in that emptiness,
there is vast, sacred silence.

The group sat motionless,
as the first star appeared
in the deepening sky.

*****

What Does It Mean to Be Aware?

Sir, the word “aware” is used so casually
that we hardly realise the depth it contains.

For most of us,
awareness is merely a faint noticing—
we notice a sound,
a sensation,
a passing thought.

But Krishnamurti uses the word in a totally different sense.

Awareness is a state of unconditioned observation,
where the mind sees without distortion,
without choice,
without the observer.

Let us look into this very patiently.

Awareness Is Not Concentration

Concentration is exclusion—
a narrowing down of attention
to a single point
through effort and discipline.

Awareness is the opposite of this.

Awareness includes everything—
the sound of the bird,
the movement of your breathing,
the thought that arises,
the feeling that stirs.

It is open,
fluid,
sensitive.

It is not effort.
It is not resistance.
It is a natural state of receptivity.

Awareness Has No Centre

When you watch yourself,
usually there is a watcher—
a centre that says:

- "I should not think this,"
- "I must be attentive,"
- "I am failing,"
- "I am succeeding."

This watcher is the self,
the past,
the conditioning.

The watcher divides the mind
and therefore, distorts perception.

In awareness,
there is only seeing,
not "I am seeing."

The observer is the observed.

Where the observer ends,
true awareness begins.

Awareness Is Without Choice

Ordinarily, when we observe,
we choose:

“I like this.”
“I dislike that.”
“This is good.”
“This is bad.”
“This should be.”
“This should not be.”

Choice distorts perception.

You cannot see clearly
when desire or fear is colouring the mind.

Choiceless awareness
is simply being with what is—
without condemnation,
without justification,
without escape.

This clarity is freedom.

Awareness Is Not Interpretation

To be aware is not to analyse.
It is not to interpret.
It is not to translate everything
according to our memory.

If you look at a tree
and immediately say, “Neem tree,”
you have stopped looking.

The word has taken the place of the seeing.

If you feel anger
and instantly think, “I am angry because…”
you are no longer observing the anger—
you are explaining it.

Explanation is not observation.
Recognition is not awareness.

To be aware is to watch a fact
without the screen of thought.

Awareness Is a Total Act

Awareness is not partial.

You cannot be aware of only your thoughts
and ignore your emotions.
You cannot be aware of your behaviour
and ignore your motives.

Awareness is
the whole movement of consciousness:

- your thoughts,
- your desires,
- your fears,
- your contradictions,
- your reactions,
- your conditioning.

It is a total watching.

And this total watching

brings order
without the imposition of will.

Awareness Is the Ending of Mechanism

Most of our life is mechanical:

- we react automatically,
- we repeat habits,
- we cling to beliefs,
- we follow patterns,
- we behave according to conditioning.

Awareness shines a light on this machinery.

When the mind sees its mechanical nature,
the very seeing ends the mechanism.

Awareness breaks the chain of repetition.

In that ending,
there is freshness,
innocence,
a newness.

Awareness Is a Flame, not a Practice

You cannot practise awareness.

Practice strengthens the “practiser”—
the ego who wants to become something.

Awareness is not the result of effort.
It is not a system,
not a method,
not a technique.

Awareness is like a flame
that burns away ignorance
the moment it is lit.

It arises naturally
when the mind is attentive.

Awareness Is Freedom from Psychological Time

When you are fully aware—
fully attentive—
there is no past or future.

The mind is not comparing,
not projecting,
not recalling.

It is with what is.

This is clarity.
This is stillness.
This is the ending of psychological time.

And in this ending,
there is a sense of immense freedom.

Awareness Brings Compassion

When you are aware without distortion,
you see yourself as you are.

In that seeing,
the whole structure of fear,
hurt,

ambition,
and isolation
comes into light.

And when the self is seen clearly,
it loosens its grip.

Where the self ends,
compassion begins.

Compassion is not cultivated.
It is the natural fragrance
of an aware mind.

Awareness Is the Beginning of Intelligence

Awareness reveals order,
reveals the truth of "what is,"
reveals the falseness of illusions.

This revelation is intelligence.

Not the intelligence measured by exams,
not the cunning intelligence of thought—
but an intelligence that is whole,
sacred,
compassionate.

Such intelligence acts rightly
without conflict.

So, what does it mean to be aware?

It means:

- to see without the past,

- to listen without interpretation,
- to feel without naming,
- to observe without choice,
- to be present without effort,
- to watch the whole movement of thought and feeling,
- to be free of the observer,
- to act from clarity rather than desire.

Awareness is the light
in which the self dissolves.

Awareness is the beginning of freedom.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, what does it really mean to be aware?”

Questioner:
When you speak about awareness,
you seem to mean something far deeper than
ordinary noticing.
I can notice a sound, a movement, a thought—
but is that awareness?
What does it truly mean to be aware?

Teacher:
Sir, awareness is not a casual noticing
or a momentary attention.
Awareness is a state of mind
in which there is no interpretation,
no judgement,
no choice,
no centre.

It is to see things as they are—
not as you wish them to be,
not as you fear them to be,
not through the distortion of memory.

Awareness is the pure act of perceiving.

“Is awareness the same as concentration?”

Questioner:
Many spiritual traditions speak of concentration.
Is awareness the same?

Teacher:
Not at all, sir.

Concentration is exclusion.
It forces the mind to focus on one thing
and shut out everything else.

But awareness includes everything—
the distant sound of a bird,
the breath moving through the body,
the arising of a thought,
the shifting of light in the room.

In awareness,
there is no resistance,
no effort.

It is effortless attention.

When the mind is aware,
it is sensitive, receptive, alive.

“But when I observe myself, there is always a ‘me’ who observes.”

Questioner:
When I try to be aware,
I find myself saying,
“I am observing this thought,”
“I am watching this fear.”
There is always a centre watching.
How can one observe without the observer?

Teacher:
The moment you say,
“I am observing,”
the observer has already separated himself
from what is being observed.

This division is the source of conflict.

But look carefully, sir.

The observer is nothing but:

- the past,
- memory,
- experience,
- knowledge,
- fear,
- judgement.

The observer is thought.

And the thought says,
“I am observing.”

In choiceless awareness
there is no observer.

There is only the thing being observed—
anger, fear, pleasure—
opening itself completely.

The observer is the observed.

When this is seen,
awareness becomes whole.

“Can awareness exist when there is choice?”

Questioner:
When I observe myself,
I immediately choose—
“I should not be angry,”
“I must be calmer,”
“I want to change this.”
Choice seems unavoidable.
Can awareness exist with choice?

Teacher:
Choice is the denial of awareness.

The moment you choose,
you are acting from the past—
from preference,
fear,
desire,
conditioning.

In awareness,
there is no choice at all.

You simply see.

You see anger as anger,
fear as fear,
pleasure as pleasure—
without condemning,
without justifying,
without escaping.

Such seeing brings its own action.

This action is instantaneous,
without conflict.

“Is awareness a form of analysis?”

Questioner:
Is being aware the same as analysing myself?

Teacher:
Absolutely not.

Analysis implies a division—
the analyser and the analysed.

And the analyser is merely another fragment of thought
pretending to be superior.

In analysis,
you examine a feeling through knowledge—
through what you have learned,
through what others have said,
through conclusions.

This takes time.

Awareness is immediate.

You look directly at the feeling
without naming it,
without judging it,
without trying to change it.

In awareness,
the fact reveals its entire structure instantly.

The seeing is the understanding.

“What does awareness reveal in daily life?”

Questioner:
If one is aware throughout the day,
what does one actually see?

Teacher:
You see your reactions—
the irritations,
the quick judgements,
the impulses of desire.

You see how thought moves—
how it arises from memory,
how it projects into the future,
how it seeks comfort,
how it avoids fear.

You see the movement of hurt
and the walls you build around yourself.

You see ambition operating in subtle ways.

You see the mechanical nature of habit.

You see the self in operation.

This seeing brings a transformation.

Not because you force it,
but because awareness itself is a transforming flame.

“Can awareness be continuous?”

Questioner:
Should we try to be aware all the time?

Teacher:
If you try,
you are no longer aware.

Trying implies effort—
and effort is the movement of the self
seeking achievement.

Awareness is not continuous.

It is a series of awakenings.

Each moment of awareness
has its own freshness.

You do not carry it over to the next moment.

The moment you say,
“I was aware yesterday; I must continue,”

you have already lost it.

Awareness is always now.

“Does awareness lead to freedom?”

Questioner:
Many teachers say awareness liberates the mind.
Is this true?

Teacher:
Awareness does not lead to freedom.

Awareness is freedom.

Because in awareness
the mind sees the whole movement of the self—
not bit by bit,
but totally.

And in that total seeing,
the self loses its grip.

Fear ends.
Hurt dissolves.
Comparison stops.
The burden of becoming drops away.

Where the self is absent,
there is freedom.

This freedom is not the opposite of bondage.
It is freedom from the entire structure of conflict.

“Is awareness the same as love?”

Questioner:
Is love part of awareness?
Or are they different things?

Teacher:
Where there is awareness,
there is no self.

Where there is no self,
there is love.

Love is not sentiment,
not emotion,
not attachment,
not pleasure.

Love is the flame
that appears
when the mind is utterly clear.

When there is awareness,
the mind is free of division.

In that freedom,
love flowers.

The Dialogue Ends in Quietness

Teacher spoke gently.

To be aware
is the simplest thing,
and therefore, the most subtle.

It is to look,
to listen,
to feel
without the interference of thought.

It is to see the movement of the self
as one sees the movement of a bird in the sky—
without choice.

Such awareness
is the beginning of intelligence,
the beginning of compassion,
the beginning of a new mind.

In awareness
the self fades.
And in that fading
there is immeasurable beauty.

The group remained silent,
as if listening to something deeper than words.

*****

To Question Everything

To inquire deeply, one must begin with a radical act: to question everything. Not merely the things that are convenient to question, but also those that are held sacred, respectable, traditional, or comforting. This questioning is not rebellion for its own sake, nor is it a reaction against authority. It is an expression of seriousness—the seriousness of wanting to discover what is true.

If one accepts something because it is said by God, by a priest, by a book, by a leader, or by the prime minister, then inquiry has already ended. Acceptance is the end of intelligence. Truth cannot be handed down, transferred, or inherited. It must be seen directly, or it is not truth at all.

Therefore, to find out, one must tear down inwardly everything that has been put together by thought.

This tearing down is not destructive in the ordinary sense. It does not lead to chaos or immorality. On the contrary, it is the only way order can come into being. As long as the mind is burdened with beliefs, ideals, conclusions, and borrowed values, it cannot see clearly. Those beliefs may be ancient, sacred, or widely respected, but they are still the products of human thought—and thought is always limited.

To question everything means to question belief, tradition, culture, religion, nationalism, and personal experience. It also means to question one's own opinions, reactions, pleasures, fears, and ambitions. It is easy to question others; it is far more difficult to question oneself without distortion.

This questioning is not analytical, nor does it seek an answer that can be stored away. The moment an answer is accepted, it becomes another conclusion, another authority. True questioning has no conclusion. It is a living movement, not a method.

In this inquiry, there is no sacred ground.

The idea of the sacred itself must be questioned. When the mind divides life into sacred and profane, it is already functioning within duality. The truly sacred is not something protected by belief, ritual, or silence imposed by tradition. It reveals itself only when the mind is completely free of fear, hope, and the desire for certainty.

To say, "There is nothing sacred," is not to deny the sacred. It is to refuse false sanctity. It is to strip the mind of all pretension, so that what is truly sacred—if it exists—may reveal itself without distortion.

This demands great inward honesty.

To find out for oneself inwardly means that there is no guide, no teacher, no path. One may listen to another, but not follow. The moment one follows, one is merely imitating, and imitation is the denial of truth.

In this inquiry, there is no authority—not even one's own past experience. Experience is always limited by memory, and memory is always old. What is old cannot discover what is new.

Therefore, the mind must stand alone.

Standing alone does not mean isolation or arrogance. It means the absence of dependence. A mind that depends—on belief, on relationship, on ideology, on comfort—cannot inquire freely. Dependence breeds fear, and fear distorts perception.

Only a fearless mind can inquire.

Such inquiry is not comfortable. It may strip away one's identity, one's sense of security, one's cherished images of oneself and the world. But without that stripping away, there can be no discovery.

The question then is not what one will find, but whether one is willing to look without escape.

When the mind is willing to question everything without seeking refuge in conclusions, a strange thing happens. There is a quality of silence—not imposed, not cultivated. In that silence, the mind is no longer occupied with defending or attacking anything. It is simply attentive.

In that attention, truth is not something to be found. It is already there.

Not as an idea, not as a belief, not as a revelation—but as a living fact.

And that fact transforms the mind, not through effort, but through understanding.

***

Questioner:
You say we must question everything. Do you really mean everything—even what is considered sacred?

Respondent:
Yes. Especially what is considered sacred. For the sacred that cannot be questioned is usually a product of fear.

Questioner:
But is it not dangerous to question everything? Does it not lead to confusion or disorder?

Respondent:
Confusion exists already, hidden beneath accepted beliefs. Questioning does not create disorder; it reveals the disorder that belief covers up.

Questioner:
Are you suggesting we should not accept anything that is told to us?

Respondent:
Acceptance ends inquiry. The moment you accept what is said by a book, a priest, a leader, or even someone you respect, you have stopped looking.

Questioner:
What about God? Surely that is beyond questioning.

Respondent:
If God cannot be questioned, then what you call God is merely an idea, protected by fear. Truth does not need protection.

Questioner:
So, you reject authority completely?

Respondent:

Outward authority has its place—traffic laws, technical knowledge. But inward authority destroys intelligence.

Questioner:
Why does inward authority destroy intelligence?

Respondent:
Because it replaces perception with obedience. When you obey inwardly, you no longer see—you conform.

Questioner:
Is tradition also an authority?

Respondent:
Tradition is accumulated thought. It may be ancient, but age does not make it true.

Questioner:
Then what are we left with if all authority is gone?

Respondent:
Nothing—and that is the beauty of it.

Questioner:
That sounds frightening. Nothing implies emptiness.

Respondent:
It is frightening only to a mind that seeks security. A mind that is empty of belief is not barren; it is open.

Questioner:
You say there is nothing sacred. Does that mean you deny the sacred?

Respondent:

No. I deny false sanctity. The sacred is not created by belief, ritual, or tradition.

Questioner:
Then how can one come upon the sacred?

Respondent:
By clearing the mind of everything that is not sacred.

Questioner:
And what is not sacred?

Respondent:
Fear, belief, ambition, dependence, and the desire for certainty.

Questioner:
Is questioning a method?

Respondent:
The moment it becomes a method, it becomes mechanical.

Questioner:
Then how does one question rightly?

Respondent:
By observing without wanting an answer.

Questioner:
Is that possible? The mind always wants a conclusion.

Respondent:
Yes, because conclusions give comfort. But comfort is not truth.

Questioner:
So, inquiry has no goal?

Respondent:
If it has a goal, it is no longer inquiry.

Questioner:
Then what sustains inquiry?

Respondent:
Passion. Not the passion of desire, but the passion to see what is.

Questioner:
Is experience part of this inquiry?

Respondent:
Experience is always the past repeating itself in a modified form. Truth is not an experience.

Questioner:
Then what role does knowledge play?

Respondent:
Knowledge is useful outwardly, but inwardly it is a barrier.

Questioner:
This seems to leave one completely alone.

Respondent:
Yes. One must stand alone inwardly. Only then is there freedom.

Questioner:
Is that not isolation?

Respondent:
Isolation is separation. Aloneness is freedom from dependence.

Questioner:
What happens to the “me” in this questioning?

Respondent:
The “me” is the bundle of beliefs, fears, and experiences you are questioning. When they are seen clearly, the “me” loses its authority.

Questioner:
Is that the end of the self?

Respondent:
It is the end of illusion. What remains is not the self.

Questioner:
And what remains then?

Respondent:
Silence.

Questioner:
Is that silence the answer?

Respondent:
Silence is not an answer. It is the ending of questions that are born of ignorance.

Questioner:
Then what is truth?

Respondent:
Truth is not what you find. It is what is when the mind stops seeking.

Questioner:
So, to question everything is to end seeking?

Respondent:
Yes. And only then is there discovery.

***

To Question Everything

I begin with no shrine,
no candle already lit,
no word already holy.

I begin by questioning.

Not politely,
not partially,
but with a fire that leaves nothing untouched.

I question God,
not to deny,
but to see whether what I worship
is truth
or merely fear wearing a sacred name.

I question scriptures,
not because they are false,
but because they are second-hand.
What is written is always old,
and truth has no age.

I question leaders,
the prime minister,

the priest,
the expert,
the one who claims to know.
For the moment I accept another's certainty,
my own seeing ends.

I question tradition,
for tradition is memory arranged as authority.
It says,
"Believe, because many have believed before you."
But numbers do not make truth.

I question morality,
respectability,
success,
nation,
culture—
all the things we hold sacred
because they give us identity.

And finally,
I question myself.

I question my beliefs,
my fears,
my hopes,
my desire to be safe,
to be right,
to be comforted.

I do not spare even my longing for truth,
for longing too can become an escape.

In this questioning
there is no method,
no direction,
no promised reward.

I am not searching for answers.
Answers are the furniture of the mind,
arranged neatly so that nothing moves.

I am watching.

Watching the mind
as it tries to hold on,
to conclude,
to make something sacred
so it can rest.

But I do not let it rest.

I tear down inwardly—
not violently,
not angrily—
but with clarity.

Every belief falls
not because I push it,
but because it cannot stand
before honest seeing.

Every authority dissolves
because I no longer kneel inwardly.

Every conclusion withers
because I refuse to live in yesterday's certainty.

Soon,
there is nothing left.

No belief to protect.
No God to worship.
No image to defend.
No path to follow.

The mind stands naked.

And in that nakedness
there is no despair,
no emptiness to be filled.

There is a strange silence—
not cultivated,
not practiced,
not invited.

A silence that comes
when the mind has nowhere to hide.

In that silence,
there is no sacred and profane.
Life is whole.

What is truly sacred
does not announce itself.
It has no name,
no temple,
no ritual.

It comes only
when the false has ended.

And that ending
is not destruction.

It is freedom.

*****

Living Without Illusion

Humanity has tried endlessly
to become something better—
through discipline, belief, reform,
through prayer, revolution, and hope.

Yet fear continues its quiet work.
Conflict changes its mask but not its nature.
Relationships fracture, heal, and fracture again.
Sorrow learns new names,
but never truly leaves.

Perhaps the problem is not failure.
Perhaps the very urge to improve
is part of the confusion.

To live without illusion
is not to step away from life,
nor to discover a special way of living.
It is to meet life as it is—
unfiltered by images,
untouched by the hunger for continuity.

Illusion does not live only in temples or theories.
It moves silently through daily life—
in fear seeking security,
in pleasure seeking repetition,
in ambition seeking fulfilment,
in learning seeking certainty,
in the image of what it means to be good.

We live surrounded by images—
images of ourselves and of others,
of success and failure,
of duty, love, and freedom.
They promise safety,

yet leave behind division and pain.

To live without illusion
is not to destroy these images,
nor to replace them with nobler ones,
but to see them as they arise
and let them end in that seeing.

This book offers no path,
no ideal to be pursued,
no method to be practised.
Time cannot free the mind from time.
Only attention can.

In attention,
action is not planned.
It happens.

Fear, pleasure, relationship, learning,
morality, education, compassion—
are not separate fields to be mastered,
but one continuous movement of living
to be observed without choice.

If these pages are read to gather meaning,
they will remain words.
If they are read to confirm belief,
they will remain echoes.

But if they are read
as one looks into a mirror—
without judgement, without escape—
then something may be revealed
that was always present
and never named.

Living without illusion
is not the reward of a long journey.

It is the quiet simplicity
of a mind that no longer deceives itself—
here,
now,
in the ordinary movement of daily life.

***

When illusion ends,
life does not become extraordinary—
it becomes simple.

Fear no longer seeks shelter in thought.
Pleasure no longer demands repetition.
Relationship is no longer shaped by image.
Action is no longer born of conflict.

To live without illusion
is not to arrive somewhere else,
but to stand where one already is—
without the weight of the past,
without the promise of tomorrow.

In that clarity,
nothing is added.
Nothing is taken away.

There is only seeing,
and in that seeing,
a life that moves without distortion.

*****

Is Living Thinking?

We live in a world shaped almost entirely by thought. This world is not only the visible one of buildings, institutions, and technologies, but the invisible psychological world of images, memories, beliefs, and conclusions. In this inner world, thought is constantly active, interpreting, judging, comparing, and projecting. It is within this movement that the sense of a separate "me" arises.

The "me" is not a fact; it is a process. It is the accumulation of past experiences identified as identity. From this accumulation arises the feeling of continuity—I was, I am, I shall be. This sense of continuity gives comfort, but it is also the root of fear. The self must protect what it believes it is, and therefore it is always in conflict—with others, with life, and with itself.

Thought is indispensable in practical matters. It enables communication, calculation, memory, and skill. But psychologically, thought creates division. It divides observer and observed, thinker and thought, "me" and "you." From this division arise comparison, ambition, envy, attachment, and violence. We may condemn these outwardly, yet inwardly we continue the very movement that sustains them.

Most of us have never questioned the dominance of thought. We assume that thinking is living. We mistake the repetition of memory for experience and the interpretation of life for understanding. Even our search for freedom is conducted by thought, which means that the search itself becomes another form of bondage. We want to be free through thought, not free from its psychological tyranny.

We speak of a life beyond illusion, but we have not learned what it means to live without the constant reference to the past. When thought interferes in relationship, there is no direct contact. One relates to images formed yesterday, not to the living being in front of us. Thus, relationship becomes a continuation of memory, and memory is always old.

The difficulty lies in this: thought cannot free itself from itself. Any effort to control, suppress, or transcend thought is still thought operating. Discipline strengthens the controller, who is himself a product of thought. Choice sustains conflict. Time promises gradual freedom, but time is another invention of thought.

Is it possible, then, to live in this world without being psychologically governed by thought? Not occasionally, not in moments of silence, but as a way of living? This question cannot be answered theoretically. It demands observation—not of what should be, but of what is.

When the mind observes its own movement without condemnation or justification, a different quality of attention comes into being. In that attention, there is no observer separate from the observed. Thought is seen as it arises, moves, and subsides. It is not resisted, nor is it encouraged. In such seeing, thought naturally finds its place.

A mind that is not dominated by thought is not blank or dull. On the contrary, it is extraordinarily alive. It responds to life directly, without the screen of memory. Intelligence, which is not the product of thought, operates. Compassion arises not as an idea but as action. Such a mind is free of illusion because it is no longer seeking security in continuity.

We have lived for centuries in the world thought has made. We have refined it, decorated it, and defended it. But we have not learned how to step out of it. That stepping out is not an escape into another illusion. It is the ending of the known. And only when the known ends does life begin.

*****

Can Life Be Lived Without Thought?

Life cannot be lived without thought in the practical, functional sense. Thought is necessary to speak, to work, to drive a car, to use language, to remember directions. Without such thought, daily living would be impossible.

But the real question is not whether life can be lived without thought, but whether life can be lived without psychological thought.

Psychological thought is the movement of memory identifying itself as "me"—my experiences, my hurts, my hopes, my fears. This thought is always the past projecting itself into the present. When it interferes with living, it distorts perception. It divides life into observer and observed, thinker and thought, controller and controlled.

Krishnamurti would say that life is never a problem; thought makes it a problem.

When psychological thought is absent, life is lived directly. There is perception without interpretation, action without delay, response without motive. In such living, thought operates only where it is needed and is silent where it has no place.

This silence is not blankness or dullness. It is intelligence. It is a mind alert, sensitive, and responsive, not burdened by accumulation.

So, Krishnamurti would not ask us to eliminate thought. He would ask us to see the place of thought. When thought

understands its own limits, it naturally falls quiet in the psychological field.

Then life is not lived according to ideas, beliefs, or purposes. It is lived as it unfolds—moment to moment.

Life cannot be lived without thought,
but it can be lived without the tyranny of thought.

That, for Krishnamurti, is freedom.

***

Life exists without the "me"; that is the ground.

Life does not depend on the "me".
The ending of the "me" is the ground of life.

Life is.
The "me" is not its ground.

Life exists; the "me" is added.

Q: What is the ground of life?
A: Not the "me".

Where the "me" is, the question of God arises.
Where the "me" is not, the question ends.

.

*****

To watch every movement of thought

To watch every movement of thought is not a discipline, not a method, and not an act of will. It is an invitation to a quality of attention that is already whole.

When one is told, "Never let one thought go without realising what it is," the mind immediately tries to do something about thought—to control it, to correct it, to refine it. But that very effort is another thought pursuing an ideal. In that pursuit, observation is lost.

Krishnamurti would ask: Can thought be watched without the watcher?

Ordinarily, there is a division: "I am watching my thoughts." That "I" is itself a bundle of thoughts—memory, experience, conditioning—pretending to be separate. As long as this division exists, observation is distorted. There is judgment: this thought is good, that one is bad; this is spiritual, that is worldly. Such watching is not seeing; it is measuring.

But when the instruction is taken seriously—not intellectually, but inwardly—something subtle happens.

You begin to notice that a thought arises before you are aware of it. By the time you say, "I am thinking," the thought has already formed. It has roots in memory, in fear, in pleasure, in habit. Seeing this fact—not as an idea but as a living movement—awakens a different attention.

In that attention:

- Thought is not condemned.

- Thought is not pursued.
- Thought is not continued.

It is simply seen.

And in seeing, its whole structure is revealed.

You may notice that a single thought never stands alone. It calls another, and another—each one leading to the next. Watch carefully and you will see that thought feeds on interest, resistance, or identification. Where there is no such feeding, thought withers naturally.

This is why the statement says, “Try it, do it, and you will see what takes place.”
Not believe, not accept, not practice daily as a system—but see.

What takes place is not mystical.

You discover that:

- Most thought is mechanical.
- Most thought is repetitive.
- Most thought has nothing to do with intelligence.

And in that discovery, there are intervals—spaces where thought does not continue. These are not cultivated silences. They come uninvited. In those spaces, there is clarity without effort, action without conflict.

Krishnamurti would insist: This watching is the highest form of meditation.
Not concentration, which excludes.
Not contemplation, which chooses.

But choiceless awareness, in which everything is allowed to show itself and therefore ends.

For a surgeon—or anyone whose life has demanded precision—this observation has a particular sharpness. Just as the hand cannot tremble during an incision, the mind, when truly attentive, does not wander. But unlike surgery, this attention has no goal, no outcome, no success to measure.

And therein lies its beauty.

When every movement of thought is seen as it arises, thought loses its tyranny. It finds its proper place. And in that ordering—not imposed but understood—there is a silence that is not manufactured.

That silence is not yours.
It is not achieved.
It is when the mind is no longer occupied with itself.

And only then is there seeing.

***

Questioner:
You say, "Watch every movement of thought; never let one thought go without realising what it is." Is that not asking for constant effort, a kind of discipline?

Speaker:
The moment you hear it as discipline; you have already moved away. Watching is not effort. Effort implies resistance, control, direction. I am not suggesting that you do something to thought. I am asking whether thought can be

seen as it moves—without the watcher standing apart from it.

Questioner:
But thought moves so quickly. Before one realises it, another has already taken its place.

Speaker:
Yes. And that very fact is important to see. Do not try to slow it down. Do not chase it. Just observe that it moves rapidly, fragmentarily, endlessly. The seeing of its speed is awareness.

Questioner:
So, the watching is not of individual thoughts, but of the whole movement?

Speaker:
Exactly. If you try to catch one thought after another, you are already lost in the net. But if there is attention to the movement itself—how thought arises, how it names, judges, compares, escapes—then thought begins to reveal its own structure.

Questioner:
Who is it that watches? Is there not always a watcher behind the watching?

Speaker:
That is the crucial question. Ordinarily, the watcher is another thought—an image saying, "I must watch, I must improve, I must be attentive." That watcher is part of the same movement. When that is seen, the division between the watcher and the watched ends.

Questioner:
Are you saying there is observation without an observer?

Speaker:
Not as an idea. Only as a fact to be discovered. When the observer is seen to be thought, then thought is looking at itself. There is no separate entity supervising the process.

Questioner:
But without an observer, how can there be control? How can one prevent wrong thoughts?

Speaker:
Why do you want to prevent? Who decides what is wrong? Thought condemning thought is still thought. In observation, there is no prevention, no indulgence. There is only seeing. And in that seeing, certain thoughts naturally lose their momentum.

Questioner:
Is that what you mean by realising a thought—seeing it fully?

Speaker:
Yes. To realise a thought is not to analyse it or trace its cause. It is to see it wholly: its feeling-tone, its intention, its memory-content, its demand for continuity. When a thought is seen completely, it ends.

Questioner:
Ends? Without being suppressed?

Speaker:
Without suppression. Suppression gives continuity in another form. But a thought that is fully seen has no ground to continue, just as a flame goes out when there is no fuel.

Questioner:
This sounds very subtle. Is it possible in daily life, in the midst of work, relationships, responsibilities?

Speaker:
If it is not possible there, it is not possible anywhere. Observation is not confined to a quiet room. It can take place while walking, speaking, operating, listening, or being hurt. In fact, relationship is the mirror in which thought shows itself most clearly.

Questioner:
But often one realises a thought only after it has acted—after anger has spoken, after fear has distorted action.

Speaker:
That too must be seen, without regret. Regret is another form of thought continuing the pattern. See the fact: thought acted unconsciously. In that seeing, awareness deepens. There is no accumulation of failure or success.

Questioner:
You keep saying "without accumulation." Why is that so important?

Speaker:
Because accumulation creates a centre— "I am becoming more aware, more watchful." That centre is time, and time is thought. Awareness is never cumulative. It is either there or not there.

Questioner:
Then what happens when one watches in this way, without choice?

Speaker:
Nothing that can be predicted. And that is important. If you watch in order to achieve silence, peace, or freedom, you are again projecting a result. But if there is pure attention, something extraordinary happens: thought finds its own place.

Questioner:
Its own place?

Speaker:
Yes. Thought is necessary in technical matters, in memory, in practical living. But when it sees itself, it no longer intrudes into areas where it has no validity—such as love, beauty, truth.

Questioner:
So, watching thought is not about perfecting thought, but about understanding its limitation?

Speaker:
Precisely. Thought is limited because it is born of the past. When that limitation is seen—not intellectually, but actually—there is a quality of mind that is not of thought.

Questioner:
Is that what you call silence?

Speaker:
Silence is not something cultivated. It comes when the noise of unnecessary thought ends. And that ending is not brought about by will, but by insight.

Questioner:

So, the invitation is simply to watch?

Speaker:
Not even an invitation. Just see whether you are watching or not. In that seeing, there is already a different movement.

Questioner:
And if one forgets to watch?

Speaker:
Then you have remembered forgetting. That too is awareness. Do not make a problem of it. Problems arise only when there is an ideal to be maintained.

Questioner:
So, the whole art is to watch without choice, without motive, without accumulation?

Speaker:
That is the whole art. And it is not an art to be practised over time, but something to be discovered freshly from moment to moment.

When thought is watched without a watcher,
it reveals its limits—
and in that revelation,
there is a silence thought cannot enter.

*****

Action without will

We have lived by will. From childhood, we are trained to assert it—to succeed, to compete, to dominate, to become something more than what we are. Will is praised as virtue: strong will, determination, ambition. Through will we seek power, position, prestige, security. And when the violence of this movement becomes visible, we excuse it by saying, "This is the result of society, of culture, of the environment in which we live."

But society is not an abstraction. Culture is not something imposed by the gods. It is the accumulated activity of human beings—of us. We are the culture. We are the society. And therefore, to blame society is to escape from seeing our own inward movement.

So, one must ask—not rhetorically, not theoretically, but actually: has will any place at all in living?

What is will? Is it not the assertion of desire in the face of resistance? "I am this, but I must be that." Between what is and what should be, will is born. And in that very division lies conflict. Will is always effort, struggle, contradiction. It is the attempt of one fragment of the mind to control another fragment. And where there is control, there is fear; where there is fear, there is violence—however refined or respectable.

We may say, "Without will nothing will be achieved." But look closely: what has been achieved through will? A world divided, endlessly competitive, driven by ambition, nationalism, belief, and authority. Each person exercising his will against another's, each group asserting itself against

another group. Is this achievement, or is it organized disorder?

Will is necessary in a very limited field—learning a language, acquiring a skill, driving a car. But when will enters the psychological realm—when it tries to shape what one should be inwardly—it becomes destructive. It breeds hypocrisy: one pretends to be what one is not. And the mind lives in constant tension, always becoming, never being.

So, the question is not how to use will rightly, but whether there is a completely different way of acting altogether, without will.

Is there an action that is not born of desire, fear, ambition, or contradiction? An action that does not arise from the idea, "I must change," but from the direct perception of what is? When one sees danger, one does not exercise will to move away—one moves instantly. That movement is not willed; it is intelligent.

In the same way, when the mind sees the truth of conflict, of ambition, of domination—not as an idea, but as a living fact—there is action without effort. Such action is not imposed. It is not cultivated. It is not the result of discipline. It flows from insight.

Will is the activity of a fragmented mind trying to become whole. But insight is the perception of fragmentation itself. And in that perception, there is an action that is whole.

So, perhaps the real revolution is not in strengthening will, but in understanding its nature and seeing its limits. And when will comes to an end in the psychological field, something entirely different begins—not forced, not

directed, not controlled—an action born of intelligence, not of struggle.

***

Questioner:
We have lived by will—will to succeed, to dominate, to achieve power, position, prestige. Without will, society tells us, nothing worthwhile can be done. Is will not essential to life?

Speaker:
Before saying it is essential, must we not first understand what will actually is? Not what we think it should be, but what it is in our daily living.

Questioner:
Is it not simply determination—the energy to overcome obstacles?

Speaker:
That is one description. But look more closely. When you say, "I must overcome," what is implied? There is what is, and there is what should be. Between the two, will is born. That gap is conflict.

Questioner:
Are you saying will is always conflict?

Speaker:
Psychologically, yes. Will is the effort of one part of the mind trying to dominate another part. "I must not be afraid." "I must become non-violent." Who is this "I" that must, and what is it that must be changed? Both are fragments of thought.

Questioner:
But without will, would we not become passive, lazy, indifferent?

Speaker:
That is a common fear. But notice how quickly the mind jumps to a conclusion. We know only two states: effort or collapse. We have never questioned whether there is a third way—action without effort.

Questioner:
You say society has conditioned us to rely on will. But surely society is larger than the individual.

Speaker:
Is it? Society is the relationship between you and me, multiplied millions of times. Our ambition, greed, fear, and desire for status have created this society. We are not separate from it.

Questioner:
So, when I say, "I am ambitious because society demands it," I am escaping?

Speaker:
Precisely. You are avoiding the fact that you are ambitious. Society is not something outside you; it is the projection of our inner state.

Questioner:
Then what happens if one abandons will? How does one act?

Speaker:
Let us go slowly. When do you act without will? When you see a physical danger—say, a precipice—you do not argue, hesitate, or exercise determination. You move instantly.

Questioner:
Because the danger is clear.

Speaker:

Yes. The perception is complete. There is no division between seeing and acting. Will is unnecessary.

Questioner:
Are you suggesting psychological action can be the same?

Speaker:
It can be, if there is complete perception. But we rarely see inward danger clearly. We see ambition as necessary, envy as human, violence as inevitable. Therefore, we attempt to modify them through will.

Questioner:
And that modification fails?

Speaker:
It only changes the pattern, not the substance. You may control anger, but it reappears as bitterness. You may suppress desire, but it returns as ambition or guilt. Will merely reshapes conflict; it does not end it.

Questioner:
Then what ends conflict?

Speaker:
Seeing it without choice. Not condemning it, not justifying it. Just seeing the fact of conflict as it arises.

Questioner:
But is not that also a form of discipline?

Speaker:
Discipline implies conformity to a pattern. Seeing has no pattern. You do not practise seeing. You either see or you do not.

Questioner:
So, the key is perception, not effort?

Speaker:
Exactly. Will says, “I must change.” Insight says, “I see.” And when you truly see something false as false, it drops away without struggle.

Questioner:
This seems to undermine the whole idea of becoming better.

Speaker:
That is precisely what is being questioned. Is psychological becoming not the root of our misery? Always reaching, never being. Always measuring ourselves against an image.

Questioner:
Then what is virtue, goodness, if not the result of will?

Speaker:
Goodness cannot be cultivated. What is cultivated is a projection of thought. Goodness comes when selfishness is understood and therefore ends—not because one wills it to end.

Questioner:
So, action without will is not careless action, but action born of understanding?

Speaker:
Yes. It is intelligence acting, not desire struggling. Such action is precise, appropriate, and whole.

Questioner:
And this intelligence is available to everyone?

Speaker:
It is not a matter of capacity, education, or culture. It is available when the mind is free from the noise of becoming.

Questioner:
So, the real question is not how to strengthen will, but whether will has any place inwardly at all?

Speaker:
That is the question. And it cannot be answered by another's authority. It must be discovered in oneself, from moment to moment.

Questioner:
Then the ending of will is not an act of will?

Speaker:
How could it be? It ends when its nature is seen. Seeing is enough.

Where will ends,
conflict ends.
And in that ending,
action begins—not born of struggle,
but of intelligence.

*****

On Attention

Attention is not the product of will. Whatever is born of effort carries conflict within it. Control implies a controller, and where there is a controller, there is division. That division dissipates energy. Therefore, attention can never arise from discipline, practice, or determination.

Attention comes into being only when there is complete observation without motive. In such observation there is no center from which one looks. The observer is not separate from what is observed. There is only the act of seeing.

This attention does not choose. It does not say, “This is pleasant, I will stay with it,” or “This is unpleasant, I must escape.” Choice belongs to thought, and thought is always fragmentary. Attention is whole. It sees ugliness and beauty with the same intensity, without preference, without comparison, without naming.

In listening, this quality is essential. Most listening is partial; it is filtered through memory, opinion, and anticipation. One listens in order to reply, to agree, or to contradict. Such listening is not listening at all. To listen is to be empty of oneself. When there is complete listening, the listener disappears, and what is said is heard directly, without distortion.

In attention there is no accumulation. The moment experience is stored; attention has ended. What remains is memory, and memory is always the past. Attention is always now. It has no continuity.

A mind that is attentive does not become dull through repetition, nor does it chase stimulation through novelty. It is sensitive without being fragile, alert without being restless.

Such a mind can live amid noise, disorder, and speed without being inwardly distorted.

Attention cannot be cultivated, practiced, or carried over from one moment to the next. The very desire to cultivate it is inattention. Attention comes only when the mind sees, with clarity, the destructive nature of inattention. That perception itself is energy.

Where there is attention, there is intelligence. And that intelligence acts without effort.

***

Questioner:
You say attention requires energy. But we try to be attentive and fail. Why is attention so difficult?

Speaker:
Because you are trying. Effort implies a center that wants to achieve a state called attention. That center is distraction itself.

Questioner:
Then how does one attend without effort?

Speaker:
See first that effort is inattention. When you see that clearly, effort drops away. What remains is observation.

Questioner:
Is observation different from attention?

Speaker:
Observation becomes attention when there is no observer. As long as there is someone observing, comparing, judging, attention is partial.

Questioner:
But surely, we must choose what to attend to?

Speaker:
Choice arises only when there is confusion. When the mind is clear, it sees what is without selecting. Attention has no preference.

Questioner:
Are you saying we must attend equally to ugliness and beauty?

Speaker:
Not "must." Attention is not obligation. It simply sees. Beauty and ugliness are responses of thought. Attention sees the fact before naming.

Questioner:
We live surrounded by noise, disorder, repetition. Doesn't that dull the mind?

Speaker:
It dulls the mind only when the mind resists or escapes. Getting used to something is a form of escape. Attention does not get used to anything.

Questioner:
And what about beauty? Surely beauty nourishes the mind.

Speaker:
Only when it is not turned into memory. The moment you possess beauty, it is gone.

Questioner:
You also speak of listening. Is listening the same as attention?

Speaker:
Listening is attention without the listener. Most people listen with conclusions already formed. That is not listening.

Questioner:
Then what is true listening?

Speaker:
Listening without anticipation, without interpretation, without the desire to reply. In such listening, there is silence.

Questioner:
And what happens in that silence?

Speaker:
Nothing happens. That is the beauty of it. Where nothing happens, there is no accumulation.

Questioner:
Can such attention be continuous?

Speaker:
If you ask for continuity, you have already lost it. Attention has no continuity. It is always now.

Questioner:
Then how does one live daily life with such attention?

Speaker:
When there is attention, living is attention. There is no division.

Questioner:
Is attention something to be cultivated?

Speaker:
Cultivation implies time. Attention is outside time.

Questioner:
Then how does attention come?

Speaker:
When the mind sees the danger of inattention—not intellectually, but actually—that very seeing is energy.

Questioner:
And that energy is attention?

Speaker:
That energy is intelligence.

*****

The Mind Addicted to Thought

If you are addicted to thought, life inevitably becomes miserable.

Thought is a necessary instrument in its own place. It is indispensable in matters of technology, communication, memory, and daily functioning. Without thought, you cannot drive a car, perform surgery, build a bridge, or use language. In its own field, thought is efficient and necessary.

But when thought oversteps its place—when it begins to interpret life, relationship, fear, sorrow, love, and death—then it becomes destructive.

Most human beings are addicted to thought. They cannot remain silent inwardly even for a moment. Thought must constantly comment, judge, compare, remember, anticipate. This incessant movement gives the illusion of living, but it is merely the repetition of the past. Such a mind is never fresh; it is always old.

Addiction to thought means the mind cannot look without interpreting. It cannot listen without translating. It cannot face a fact without immediately turning it into an idea, an explanation, or an escape. In this addiction, thought becomes the centre—the "me"—and life is approached only through that centre.

From this arise conflict, fear, and sorrow.

When thought dominates psychologically, it fragments life. It divides observer and observed, thinker and thought, "me" and "not me." From this division arise effort, control,

suppression, and resistance. And where there is resistance, there is conflict. Conflict is the very essence of misery.

Life then becomes a problem to be solved rather than a movement to be understood.

If thought is not given its right place, it demands authority where it has none. It tries to resolve fear by analysis, sorrow by explanation, loneliness by belief, death by hope. But thought, being limited and time-bound, can never touch that which is living, whole, and timeless. It can only circle around it endlessly.

This is why a mind dominated by thought is always restless. It seeks methods, practices, conclusions. It moves from one idea to another, one belief to another, one experience to another—never still, never free. Such a mind calls this movement growth or progress, but inwardly it is trapped.

To give thought its right place is not to suppress it, discipline it, or control it. Control is still thought acting upon itself. Nor is it to cultivate silence as an ideal. Silence that is cultivated is another form of noise.

Thought naturally falls into its right place when it sees its own limitation.

When the mind sees—actually, not verbally—that thought cannot resolve psychological suffering, cannot create love, cannot touch truth, then thought becomes quiet without effort. This quietness is not imposed; it is the result of understanding.

In that quietness, there is attention. And attention is not thought.

Attention has no centre, no motive, no direction. It does not choose. It does not judge. In such attention, life is no longer filtered through memory. Relationship is no longer an image meeting another image. Fear is no longer resisted or analysed; it is seen, and therefore it ends.

Only then does thought function sanely, efficiently, and beautifully—where it is needed, and nowhere else.

A mind that is free of addiction to thought is not dull. On the contrary, it is intensely alive. It can think when necessary and be completely silent when thinking is unnecessary. Such a mind is no longer burdened by itself.

Then life is no longer miserable, not because problems have been solved, but because the mind that created psychological misery is no longer governing.

*****

Seeing the Falsity of Thought

The Importance of Seeing the Falsity of Thought

Thought has extraordinary importance in its own field. It is necessary for communication, for technology, for memory, for daily functioning. Without thought, there would be no practical order in life. But when thought enters the psychological field—when it tries to understand fear, sorrow, love, or truth—it creates illusion.

The importance, then, is not in controlling thought, disciplining it, or trying to go beyond it, but in seeing its falsity where it is false.

Thought is always old. It is born of memory, experience, and conditioning. Therefore, whatever thought touches inwardly becomes the continuation of the past. When thought says, "I am afraid," "I must change," "I will become better," it is not observing the fact; it is translating the fact into the language of time. And where there is time, there is postponement; where there is postponement, there is conflict.

Most human beings do not see the falsity of thought. They see its utility and mistake that utility for truth. Because thought works efficiently in the outer world, they assume it must also work inwardly. This assumption is the root of psychological disorder.

Thought creates the observer—the "me"—and then pretends that this observer can watch, judge, correct, and improve itself. But the observer is thought. The observer is the accumulation of memory, fear, pleasure, and experience. When thought divides itself into observer and observed, it

produces contradiction. This contradiction is lived as effort, struggle, control, guilt, and despair.

Seeing the falsity of thought is therefore of immense importance, because without this seeing, the mind is caught in endless self-deception.

To see the falsity of thought is not an intellectual conclusion. One may repeat endlessly, "Thought is limited," and yet live completely under its domination. Seeing is an act of direct perception. Just as one sees the danger of a precipice instantly, without argument or analysis, so one must see the danger of thought operating where it has no place.

When thought tries to resolve fear, it sustains fear.
When thought tries to end sorrow, it prolongs sorrow.
When thought tries to discover truth, it creates belief.

This is not a theory; it is a fact that can be observed in oneself.

The importance of seeing this falsity lies in what happens when it is seen. Thought does not gradually withdraw. There is no practice involved. When falsity is seen as false, it ends. It has no authority. It has no energy.

In that ending, there is silence—not the silence of suppression, not the silence cultivated through discipline, but a silence born of understanding. This silence is not emptiness; it is clarity. It is a state in which the mind is no longer divided against itself.

Only in such silence is there attention.

Attention is not thought. It is not concentration. It has no centre and no direction. In attention, there is no observer

separate from what is observed. Fear is not analysed; it is seen. Sorrow is not explained; it is faced. And in that direct seeing, there is transformation—not as a result, but as a fact.

If thought is not seen as false where it is false, life becomes a series of reactions. One belief replaces another, one conclusion replaces another, one experience replaces another. The mind moves endlessly within the field of the known and calls this movement living. But it is only continuity.

The importance of seeing the falsity of thought, therefore, is that it ends continuity. And where continuity ends, there is renewal. Only then is there a mind that is fresh, innocent, and capable of meeting life as it is—not as it was or as it should be.

Truth is not the product of thought.
Freedom is not the achievement of thought.

They come into being only when the falsity of thought is seen—completely, choicelessly, and now.

*****

Is prayer a corruption?

What is prayer?

Prayer is generally the act of asking, pleading, hoping, seeking comfort, seeking protection, or seeking reward—from God, from an image, from an idea of something greater than oneself. It may be silent or spoken, ritualistic or spontaneous. But inwardly, its structure is similar: there is a demander and something demanded from.

Now, observe this without judgment.

When a human being prays, is he not in a state of fear, uncertainty, sorrow, or desire? One prays when one is in trouble, when one is confused, lonely, frightened, ambitious, or longing for security. Prayer then becomes a movement born of insufficiency.

Krishnamurti would ask:
Is this not a subtle form of escape?

Instead of facing fear, sorrow, or uncertainty directly—without an intermediary—one turns to prayer. One hands over responsibility to an image called God, fate, grace, or divine will. This handing over gives temporary comfort, just as a drug gives relief. But comfort is not truth.

Prayer strengthens the psychological self.
"I am weak; You are strong."
"I am confused; You will guide me."
"I am suffering; You will console me."

In this division between "me" and "that which I pray to," the center—the "I"—is sustained. And where there is a center, there is fear, dependence, hope, and disappointment.

Is this not corruption?

Not corruption in the moral sense—but in the sense that truth is distorted by desire.

Prayer is often praised as humility, but is it humility? Or is it the disguised arrogance of asking the universe to arrange itself according to one's personal needs?

And notice something more subtle:
When millions pray—for peace, for success, for victory—whose prayer is answered? The prayer of the strong, the clever, the organized? Then prayer becomes another instrument of conflict.

Krishnamurti would say:
Prayer can only receive what the mind already knows.

What is prayed for is projected by thought. Thought cannot touch the immeasurable. Therefore, prayer can never lead to truth; it can only echo one's conditioning.

Then what about silence?

Silence is not prayer.
Silence does not ask.
Silence does not beg.
Silence does not seek.

In silence, there is no demander and nothing demanded. There is no center. In such silence, if something sacred comes, it is not invited—it comes because the mind is empty, not because it is pious.

So, the question is not whether prayer is good or bad.
The question is: Why do we pray at all?

If one sees directly that prayer is born of fear, loneliness, and the longing for psychological security—then prayer falls away naturally. And in that falling away, there may be a state of attention in which there is no corruption, because there is no "me" seeking something.

Truth does not come through prayer.
Truth comes when the mind is utterly still, with nothing to ask.

That stillness is not sacred because it is religious.
It is sacred because it is free of the self.

***

Questioner:
Is prayer sacred, or is it a corruption of something sacred?

Responder:
Before we call it sacred or corrupt, must we not first see what prayer actually is—not what tradition says, not what comfort says, but what fact says?

Questioner:
Prayer is speaking to God. Asking. Giving thanks. Seeking help.

Responder:
That is the description. But what is the inward movement when one prays?

Questioner:
One feels helpless. One hopes. One seeks guidance.

Responder:

So, prayer arises when there is fear, uncertainty, sorrow, or desire. Rarely does one pray in clarity or abundance. One prays when one does not know what to do.

Questioner:
Is that wrong?

Responder:
There is no question of right or wrong. Only of seeing. When you pray, are you facing your fear, or are you escaping from it?

Questioner:
Prayer gives strength to face it.

Responder:
Does it? Or does it postpone the facing by offering consolation? Is strength born of comfort, or of understanding?

Questioner:
But prayer gives hope.

Responder:
Hope is projected into the future. Fear is in the present. By hoping, you avoid the present fact.

Questioner:
Are you saying prayer is an escape?

Responder:
Observe it. When a child is frightened, he clings to his mother. Prayer is psychological clinging—to an image, an idea, a belief. It is not communion; it is dependence.

Questioner:
But people say prayer brings peace.

Responder:
So does alcohol, so does belief, so does authority. Peace produced by dependence is not peace; it is sedation.

Questioner:
Then what about gratitude? Thanking God?

Responder:
Whom do you thank? An image created by thought? And if you thank for pleasure, do you also thank for pain? Or do you call pain a test, a punishment, or karma?

Questioner:
That is how religion explains suffering.

Responder:
Religion explains; truth does not explain. Explanation is another form of escape.

Questioner:
Are you saying prayer strengthens the self?

Responder:
I am asking you to see it. In prayer there is always a center—the one who prays. "I am small; You are great. Help me." This sustains the 'I', does it not?

Questioner:
Is the 'I' the problem?

Responder:

Where there is an ‘I’, there is fear. Where there is fear, there is the demand for protection. Prayer is that demand.

Questioner:
But is it not humility to kneel, to surrender?

Responder:
Is surrender an act of will? Can humility be cultivated? Or does humility come only when the self is absent—not kneeling, not asserting, not asking?

Questioner:
Then what about collective prayer—for peace, for the world?

Responder:
If prayer worked, the world would have been peaceful long ago. People pray for peace and prepare for war. Prayer does not transform consciousness; it only expresses it.

Questioner:
Is prayer therefore corrupt?

Responder:
Corrupt not morally, but psychologically. It distorts the search for truth by mixing it with desire, fear, and hope.

Questioner:
Is there then no place for the sacred?

Responder:
On the contrary. The sacred cannot come through prayer. Prayer is noise. The sacred is silence.

Questioner:
What kind of silence?

Responder:
Not cultivated silence. Not the silence of discipline. But silence that comes when the mind is no longer asking, no longer begging, no longer seeking.

Questioner:
Then what is meditation, if not prayer?

Responder:
Meditation is not a movement toward something. It is the ending of movement. When the mind is completely still—without effort, without motive—there is no 'me' to pray.

Questioner:
And in that stillness?

Responder:
There is no experiencer to name it. Therefore, it cannot be corrupted.

Questioner:
So, prayer ends when understanding begins?

Responder:
Prayer ends when fear ends. When fear ends, the mind is alone, and in that aloneness, there is great beauty.

Questioner:
Then what should one do when suffering arises?

Responder:
Do not pray. Do not escape. Look. Stay with the suffering without naming, without asking for help. In that attention, suffering undergoes a transformation.

Questioner:
That is frightening.

Responder:
Yes. Truth is frightening because it leaves you with no support. But only a mind without support can discover what is real.

Questioner:
So, prayer is unnecessary?

Responder:
Truth needs no intermediary. Where there is complete attention, there is no corruption—and no prayer.

*****

Can the future be known?

Krishnamurti would begin by asking:

Why do you want to know the future at all?

Is it curiosity? Or is it fear—fear of uncertainty, fear of insecurity, fear of suffering?
The mind that seeks assurance about tomorrow is a frightened mind.

Astrology promises certainty where there is none. It says: Your life is already written; therefore, you are safe.
But that very promise dulls intelligence.

Krishnamurti was very clear:
Any system that claims to know the future denies freedom.

If your future is fixed by stars, planets, karma, or ancient texts, then what place is there for awareness, intelligence, or transformation? You become a prisoner of interpretation—waiting for events rather than understanding yourself.

About the Vedas

Krishnamurti never denied the antiquity, beauty, or intellectual depth of the Vedas. But he questioned authority—especially spiritual authority.

He would say:

The Vedas are the accumulated knowledge and experience of human beings—however ancient, however revered.

Knowledge is always of the past. And the past can never meet the living present.

Truth is not ancient or modern.
Truth is not Indian, Hindu, or Vedic.
Truth is not in any book.

When people say, “The Vedas contain this knowledge,” Krishnamurti would ask:

Is knowledge the same as wisdom?

You may know the movement of stars, but do you know the movement of fear in your own heart? You may calculate eclipses, but can you look at jealousy without escaping?

Astrology and Conditioning

Krishnamurti saw astrology as part of psychological conditioning.

If you are told you will suffer, you unconsciously prepare to suffer.
If you are told you will succeed, you become careless or ambitious.

In either case, your action is shaped by belief, not by perception.

He would say:

Belief is always the denial of intelligence.

Intelligence is not prediction.
Intelligence is perception of what is.

Does Astrology Sometimes "Work"?

Krishnamurti would not be impressed by occasional accuracy.

A clock that is broken is right twice a day.

Coincidence, probability, suggestion, and selective memory are mistaken for truth. But truth does not depend on being right or wrong; it is free of method.

The moment you depend on astrology, you stop observing yourself. You hand over responsibility for your life to stars, priests, or books.

What About Fate and Karma?

Krishnamurti would say:

As long as you believe you are bound by fate, you will never discover freedom.

Freedom is not in the future.
Freedom is in the ending of psychological dependence now.

Krishnamurti's Core Question

He would not ask, "Is astrology true?"
He would ask:

What happens to your mind when you believe in it?

Does it become sharp, alert, alive?
Or does it become lazy, dependent, frightened, and imitative?

In His Spirit, the Conclusion

Astrology may describe patterns.
The Vedas may contain vast knowledge.

But truth is not a pattern, and freedom is not predicted.

The future is not something to be known.
It is something to be met with clarity.

And clarity comes only when the mind is free from authority—
whether of the stars, the scriptures, or the past.

***

Questioner:
People say astrology can tell what will happen in the future. They say this knowledge is contained in the Vedas. What would you say to that?

Responder:
Before we ask whether it is true, may we first ask why such a statement is attractive? Why does the mind want to know the future?

Questioner:
Because life is uncertain. One wants to be prepared.

Responder:
Prepared for what?

Questioner:
For suffering, failure, loss… or success.

Responder:
So, the desire to know the future is born of fear and hope.

Questioner:
Naturally. Is that wrong?

Responder:
Again, there is no question of right or wrong. Only of seeing. When fear asks for certainty, does it become free, or more imprisoned?

Questioner:
But astrology gives guidance.

Responder:
Guidance replaces intelligence. The moment you follow guidance; your own perception becomes secondary.

Questioner:
Are you denying that astrology works? Many predictions come true.

Responder:
Truth is not measured by occasional success. A system may sometimes be right and still destroy freedom. The question is not; does it work? but What does it do to the mind that believes in it?

Questioner:
It gives confidence.

Responder:
Or dependence. Confidence that comes from outside is always fragile.

Questioner:
But the Vedas are ancient. Surely such old knowledge has validity.

Responder:
Ancient does not mean true. Old poison is still poison. Age gives authority only to those who seek authority.

Questioner:
Are you dismissing the Vedas?

Responder:
I am dismissing authority, not texts. The Vedas are the accumulated experience and knowledge of human beings. Knowledge is always of the past. Can the past ever understand the living present?

Questioner:
Then is there no wisdom in the scriptures?

Responder:
There is information, insight, poetry, philosophy. But wisdom is not transferable. You cannot inherit truth.

Questioner:
Astrology is not merely belief; it is calculation—planets, movements, cycles.

Responder:
You may calculate the movement of stars. But can you calculate sorrow? Can you predict fear? Can you chart the ending of greed?

Questioner:
Astrology speaks of karma—cause and effect.

Responder:
Psychological cause and effect is not mechanical. If you are greedy today, you may see greed and end it tomorrow. Where then is karma?

Questioner:
But surely there are patterns in life.

Responder:
Yes, when the mind repeats, life repeats. Astrology describes repetition, not transformation.

Questioner:
So, you deny destiny?

Responder:
As long as you believe in destiny, you deny responsibility. As long as you deny responsibility, you cannot change.

Questioner:
Isn't freedom itself part of destiny?

Responder:
Freedom cannot be part of a pattern. Freedom is the breaking of pattern.

Questioner:
People say knowing the future helps them avoid mistakes.

Responder:
On the contrary, it prevents learning. When you already "know" what will happen, you stop observing what is happening.

Questioner:
But many feel comforted by astrology.

Responder:
Comfort is not truth. Truth is often uncomfortable because it leaves you alone—with no guide, no chart, no prediction.

Questioner:
Is there something wrong in seeking reassurance?

Responder:
See what reassurance does. It makes the mind dull. A dull mind seeks security; a sharp mind faces uncertainty.

Questioner:
Then how should one live without knowing the future?

Responder:
By understanding the present completely. The future is contained in the present. If you see the present without distortion, the future takes care of itself.

Questioner:
That sounds dangerous.

Responder:
Yes. Truth is dangerous to all forms of psychological security.

Questioner:
So, astrology, scriptures, predictions—what place do they have?

Responder:
They have a place as knowledge, not as truth. The moment knowledge becomes authority, intelligence dies.

Questioner:
Then what is intelligence?

Responder:
Intelligence is sensitivity to what is, without fear. It does not ask what will happen; it acts rightly now.

Questioner:
And the sacred?

Responder:
The sacred is not in the future and not in the stars. It is only where the mind is free of fear, free of authority, free of becoming.

Questioner:
So, the future cannot be known?

Responder:
The future can be predicted only by a mechanical mind. But a free mind is not mechanical—and therefore cannot be predicted.

Questioner:
Then to seek the future is to lose freedom?

Responder:
Yes. The mind that wants certainty is already uncertain. The mind that sees uncertainty without escape is free.

***

They say
the stars have spoken,
that the future is already written

in silent constellations,
in ancient syllables,
in books browned by time.

They say,
“Your life has a pattern.
Your sorrow has a date.
Your joy has an hour.
Your ending is foretold.”

And the mind listens—
because it is afraid.

Fear does not want truth;
it wants assurance.
Fear does not ask to see;
it asks to be comforted.

So, the mind looks upward,
away from itself,
and calls this looking—wisdom.

But can the stars carry your sorrow?
Can a planet know your jealousy,
your loneliness in the night,
your sudden cruelty,
your unspoken grief?

The stars move in order.
But the mind moves in confusion.

Order in the sky
does not bring order within.

They say,

“The Vedas knew.
The ancients saw far.
They mapped the unseen.”

But knowledge, however ancient,
is still knowledge.
And knowledge is always yesterday.

Yesterday cannot meet today.

Truth is not inherited.
Freedom is not handed down.
No book, however sacred,
can tell you how to look
at your fear now.

The future is sought
only by a mind
that cannot bear the present.

To know what will happen
is to avoid what is happening.

When you are told
you will suffer,
you prepare to suffer.

When you are told
you will succeed,
you become careless or greedy.

Thus, belief shapes action,
and action confirms belief—
a perfect circle of illusion.

Astrology describes repetition,
not transformation.

It tells you
what you have been,
again and again,
under different names.

But the moment you see yourself
without explanation,
without prediction,
without escape—
the pattern ends.

Freedom is not written in the stars.
It is born when the mind
no longer consults the past
to meet the present.

The future is not somewhere ahead.
It is forming now,
in every thought,
every fear,
every avoidance.

See fear clearly,
and fear has no future.

See greed wholly,
and greed has no tomorrow.

The sacred does not announce itself
through prediction.
It comes only when the mind
is utterly alone—

without chart,
without guide,
without hope.

Then there is no need
to ask what will happen.

Life unfolds,
not according to destiny,
but according to clarity.

And clarity
has no horoscope.

*****

Seeing is Acting

When there is clear perception, there is no interval between seeing and doing.
The interval exists only when there is confusion.

We think action must be prepared, practiced, learned, or guided. But preparation belongs to time, and time belongs to thought. Where thought interferes, action is delayed, modified, or avoided. That delay is the very movement of disorder.

When you see danger, you act instantly.
You do not consult a book, a belief, or an authority.
You do not ask, “What is the right action?”
The perception is the action.

Understanding is not intellectual agreement.
Understanding is not saying, “Yes, that sounds reasonable.”
Understanding is a direct seeing—so complete that there is no alternative.

If you see a precipice, you step back.
You do not debate whether stepping back is practical.

In the same way, if one sees that hatred, division, ambition, and self-interest are destructive—not as ideas, not as philosophies, but as living facts—then there is immediate action. That action is love.

But most of us do not see.
We speculate.

We say, “Love is beautiful, but impractical.”

“Love is ideal, but the world is brutal.”
“Love is for saints, not for people like us.”

These statements are not insights; they are escapes.

The mind invents theories because it is afraid of action.
Beliefs become a refuge from responsibility.
Ideals become substitutes for transformation.

Instead of acting, we ask, “What must I do?”
And in asking, we postpone.

The question “What must I do?” is born of not seeing.
When you see, there is no question.

You do not ask how to love.
You love.

You do not practice love.
You do not cultivate it.
You do not arrive at it through discipline.

The very attempt to learn love is the denial of it.

That is why no one can teach you love.
No book can describe it.
No guru can hand it to you.

The moment you accept a description; you are already imitating.
And imitation is not love.

Love comes only when the self—with its fears, ambitions, images, and conclusions—is absent. And the self ends only

when it is seen clearly, not condemned, not justified, not analysed endlessly, but seen as one sees a snake on the path.

Seeing is acting.

If one truly sees that this world is in chaos because of the "me" and the "mine," because of nationalism, belief, and psychological security, then to live without them is not difficult—it is inevitable.

Difficulty arises only when perception is partial.

So, the real question is not, "How can I love?"
But, "Why don't I see?"

And the answer lies in this:
Seeing demands complete attention.
And we are rarely attentive—because attention has no reward, no promise, no future.

But when attention is there, effortlessly, choicelessly,
action is immediate, whole, and right.

That action is love.

***

Questioner:
You say that when one sees something clearly, there is immediate action. But is that really so? Don't most actions require thought, planning, and choice?

Responder:
Planning is necessary for technical matters. But we are not talking of technique. We are talking of living. When you see a danger, do you plan how to respond to it?

Questioner:
No. One moves instantly.

Responder:
Exactly. There is no gap between perception and action. The danger is seen, and the body responds. In that moment there is no thinker deciding to act.

Questioner:
But in psychological matters—anger, fear, violence—one does not act so instantly.

Responder:
Because one does not see them as danger. One has ideas about them, explanations, justifications. Ideas dull perception.

Questioner:
So, ideas prevent action?

Responder:
Yes. Ideas are substitutes for seeing. When you are busy with ideas, you are no longer in contact with fact.

Questioner:
People talk endlessly about love, peace, goodness. Are these also ideas?

Responder:
For most people, yes. Love becomes a concept, an ideal, something to be achieved. The moment love becomes an ideal, it is no longer love.

Questioner:
Why is that?

Responder:
An ideal belongs to the future. Love is now, or it is not at all.

Questioner:
But surely one must understand love before one can act from it.

Responder:
Understanding is acting. There is no understanding first and action later. That division is invented by thought.

Questioner:
Yet people say, “I understand intellectually, but I cannot live it.”

Responder:
Then they do not understand. Intellectual agreement is not understanding. Understanding is total perception.

Questioner:
You mean like physical pain?

Responder:
Yes. When you have a toothache, you do not discuss theories about dentistry. You act. Pain allows no postponement.

Questioner:
Are you saying psychological suffering should act the same way?

Responder:
It would, if you did not escape from it. You escape through beliefs, explanations, hope, and time.

Questioner:
Time?

Responder:
Time says, “I will change tomorrow.” Time gives you comfort, and comfort prevents action.

Questioner:
So, when one says, “I must gradually learn to love,” that is an escape?

Responder:
Yes. Love is not learned. What is learned is behaviour, conformity, imitation. Love has no method.

Questioner:
But if I say, “I don’t know what love is,” what am I to do?

Responder:
Nothing. Do not ask another. Do not search for a definition. Simply observe what is not love—fear, attachment, jealousy, ambition.

Questioner:
Is that enough?

Responder:
When falsehood is seen as false, truth is. You do not cultivate truth; you end falsehood.

Questioner:
Yet people prefer beliefs.

Responder:
Because beliefs relieve them of action. A belief acts for them. It tells them what to think, how to behave.

Questioner:
So, beliefs are inventions to avoid acting?

Responder:
Yes. Belief is laziness of the mind.

Questioner:

That sounds harsh.

Responder:
Truth is not concerned with comfort. Beliefs promise security, but they breed violence, division, and imitation.

Questioner:
Then what happens when one truly sees that love is the only way out of this confusion?

Responder:
Then there is action—not according to an ideal, not according to a plan, but naturally, effortlessly.

Questioner:
Is that action always, right?

Responder:
Right and wrong are measures of thought. Action born of clear perception is intelligent.

Questioner:
So, the crisis of the world is really a crisis of perception?

Responder:
Yes. We do not see the danger of hatred, nationalism, belief, as we see the danger of fire.

Questioner:
If we did?

Responder:
We would drop them instantly.

Questioner:
Then why don’t we see?

Responder:
Because seeing demands attention, and attention demands the ending of the self—the one who wants reward, security, continuity.

Questioner:
So, love comes when the self is absent?

Responder:
Love is the absence of the self.

Questioner:
And that absence cannot be cultivated?

Responder:
No. Cultivation implies time and effort. Effort is resistance.

Questioner:
Then what is one to do?

Responder:
Again, you ask what to do. See that question as an escape. Observe without asking. In observation, there is action.

Questioner:
So, seeing is acting.

Responder:
Yes. And where there is such action, there is no confusion—and therefore, love.

*****

Reality, Actuality and Truth

Reality

For JK, reality is the field of thought.

- Thought is born of memory, experience, knowledge, time.
- Whatever thought touches, names, measures, compares, becomes reality.
- Therefore, reality is man-made, psychological, and relative.

This includes:

- Nations, religions, beliefs
- The "me" and the "you"
- Ideals, gods, images, fears, hopes
- Even psychological suffering and pleasure

JK would say:

Reality is what thought has put together.

Reality can change, be modified, improved, destroyed—because thought itself is movement.

So:

- Reality is conditioned
- Reality is fragmentary
- Reality is within time

Reality is not false in the ordinary sense—it functions—but it is limited.

Truth

Truth, for Krishnamurti, is not the opposite of reality; it is of a different dimension altogether.

Truth is:

- Not made by thought
- Not reached by effort
- Not accumulated
- Not continuous

Truth is timeless.

He famously said:

Truth is a pathless land.

Why?
Because any path is created by thought, and truth is beyond the known.

Truth:

- Cannot be remembered
- Cannot be repeated
- Cannot be practiced
- Cannot be owned

The moment you say "I have understood truth," it has already become reality (thought).

So:

- Reality belongs to the known
- Truth is in the unknown

Truth is not an idea, experience, or conclusion. It is what is, when the mind is utterly still—without a center.

Actuality — the most subtle term

This is where many misunderstand JK.

Actuality is not truth.
Actuality is not reality either.

Actuality is what is happening now, factually, before interpretation.

Let us be precise.

If I say:

- "I am angry" — that is actuality only if I am directly seeing anger without naming, judging, or escaping.

But the moment I say:

- "I should not be angry"
- "Anger is bad"
- "I was angry yesterday"

— it becomes reality (thought acting on the fact).

So, actuality is:

- The fact
- The movement
- The living thing as it is

Krishnamurti often said:

Truth is in the perception of what is.

That "what is" is actuality.

But be careful:

- Seeing actuality does not mean analysing it
- Seeing actuality does not mean accepting or rejecting it

Actuality is seen, not used.

The relationship between the three

Let us place them carefully, without mixing them.

Reality
- Constructed by thought
- Psychological and social
- Based on time and memory

Actuality
- The fact of the moment
- Direct perception
- Neither thought nor idea

Truth
- Reveals itself when actuality is seen completely
- Not separate from actuality, but not contained in it
- Timeless, immeasurable

Krishnamurti would say:
- When actuality is observed without the interference of reality, truth is.

Truth is not produced by seeing actuality.
Truth is there when the observer is absent.

A crucial subtlety (often missed)

Actuality can still be distorted if there is an observer.

For example:

- “I am watching my fear” — still division.
- “I must understand my fear” — still becoming.

Actuality flowers only when:

- There is no watcher
- No movement of becoming
- No psychological time

Then:

- Actuality is not experienced
- Truth is not known

There is only seeing.

In one quiet sentence

- Reality is what thought has made.
- Actuality is the naked fact.
- Truth is when the fact is seen without the thinker.

***

Fear

Reality of fear

Fear, as we usually know it, is reality.

Why?
Because it is:

- Fear of what might happen
- Fear remembered from yesterday
- Fear projected into tomorrow

This fear is sustained by:

- Images
- Words
- Past experiences
- Anticipation

That is reality—thought in time.

Krishnamurti would say:

Fear exists only when there is a movement away from what is.

Actuality of fear

Now look very carefully.

Fear, in actuality, is:

- A tightening in the body
- A sensation
- A surge of energy
- A chemical and neurological response

At this moment, without naming it "fear":

- There is a vibration
- A sensation in the stomach or chest

That is actuality.

The moment thought says:

- "This is fear"
- "Why am I afraid?"
- "I must get rid of it"

— actuality is lost, and reality takes over.

Actuality has no continuity.

Truth in relation to fear

When fear is seen:

- Without naming
- Without escape
- Without observer

Then there is:

- No “me” who is afraid
- No time
- No becoming fearless

In that choiceless perception, fear ends.

Truth is not:

- “I have overcome fear”
- “I am now fearless”

Truth is:

Fear has no root when the mind does not move away.

Sorrow

This is deeper.

Reality of sorrow

Sorrow as reality includes:

- My loss
- My pain
- My story
- My suffering compared with yours

Thought says:

- "Why did this happen to me?"
- "Time will heal"
- "I must find meaning"

This is sorrow extended in time—reality.

Krishnamurti was uncompromising here:

Time does not heal sorrow.

Time only covers it.

Actuality of sorrow

Actual sorrow is:

- A profound emptiness
- A sense of utter vulnerability
- A silence filled with pain

Not:

- Self-pity
- Explanation
- Resistance

If you stay with that emptiness—without movement—

- No naming
- No escape
- No hope

That is actuality.

Most minds cannot stay here; they rush into reality.

Truth in relation to sorrow

When sorrow is fully faced:

- Not my sorrow
- Not your sorrow

But sorrow as a human fact

Then something extraordinary happens:

- Compassion is born
- Not cultivated
- Not practiced

Truth here is:

When sorrow is not personal, love is.

Sorrow ends not through understanding, but through total contact.

Death

This is the most radical test.

Reality of death

Reality of death is:

- Fear of losing
- Fear of non-existence
- Belief in afterlife or annihilation
- Attachment to continuity

Thought says:

- "I will die"
- "What will happen to me?"
- "I am afraid of losing everything"

This is death as an idea—reality.

Actuality of death

Actuality of death is not future.

Actuality of death is:

- The ending of each moment
- The ending of attachment
- The ending of memory's continuity

Krishnamurti said:

To die every day is to live.

Actual death is psychological death now:

- Ending the 'me'
- Ending accumulation
- Ending continuity

This is actuality—not philosophy.

Truth in relation to death

When the mind dies to:

- The past
- Identity
- Experience
- Knowledge as security

Then:

- Death is not opposite of life
- Death is life

Truth here is:

Only a mind that knows how to die can live.

There is no experiencer of death—only ending.

The single thread running through all three

Fear, sorrow, and death persist because:

- Reality interferes with actuality.

When:

- Fear is allowed to be fear
- Sorrow is allowed to be sorrow
- Death is allowed to be ending

Without the observer—

Truth is not something that comes.
Reality simply falls away.

A final austere statement

Reality continues through thought.
Actuality is the fact.
Truth is when the fact is seen without the self.

*****

On seeing a fact

To listen and to see rightly is not a technique to be cultivated over time; it is an act of attention in which there is no centre demanding results. Most of us listen with conclusions already formed, and we see through the screen of opinion, judgment, and condemnation. In such seeing there is distortion, and therefore conflict. What is observed is never the fact, but the idea about the fact.

To see something as it is requires that the observer does not interfere. When one looks at ambition, for example, the mind immediately moves to justification or denial: whether ambition is necessary, respectable, or dangerous; what will happen if one is not ambitious; how society will react. All this movement is thought protecting itself. It is not observation. It is escape.

To see the fact of ambition means to watch it without naming, without comparing, without choosing. It is neither to suppress it nor to indulge it, but to allow it to reveal itself fully. In that choiceless observation, the division between the observer and the observed dissolves. There is no longer a separate ‘me’ watching ambition; there is only the fact unfolding in awareness.

When the observer is not, there is no conflict. Conflict exists only where there is division—between what is and what should be, between the fact and the image. The ending of this division is not brought about by effort or discipline, but by complete attention. Such attention is effortless because it is not driven by motive.

From this undivided seeing comes energy. This energy is not born of struggle, control, or resistance; those forms of energy are destructive, fragmentary, and exhausting. The energy released through complete perception is quiet, expansive, and intelligent. It is the energy of clarity.

Without this energy, the mind is dull, repetitive, and mechanical. With it, there is sensitivity, compassion, and intelligence. Therefore, to see a fact totally is not a minor psychological exercise; it is the foundation of a life that is not fragmented.

Seeing is action.
And in that action, there is freedom.

***

Q: Why is it so difficult to listen and to see things as they are?

A: Because we rarely listen or see without the interference of thought. We listen through conclusions, and we see through opinions, judgments, and condemnations. What we encounter is not the fact, but our reaction to it.

Q: What do you mean by seeing a fact?

A: To see a fact is to observe what is actually taking place, without distortion. For example, to see that one is ambitious—not whether ambition is right or wrong, noble or destructive, necessary or avoidable—but simply to see the fact of ambition as it operates.

Q: But is it not natural to judge? Surely judgment helps us correct ourselves.

A: Judgment is the movement of thought comparing what is with what should be. In that movement, the fact is already lost. Correction implies an ideal, and the ideal prevents direct perception. Where there is judgment, there is no seeing—only measurement.

Q: So, what happens when one looks at a fact without judgment?

A: When a fact is seen without naming, condemning, or justifying, the observer does not stand apart from what is observed. There is no 'me' watching ambition; there is only the fact itself in awareness.

Q: Is this what you mean by the ending of the observer and the observed?

A: Yes. The observer is made of memory, experience, and knowledge. When these do not interfere, observation is whole. In such seeing, division ends, and therefore conflict ends.

Q: Does conflict always arise from division?

A: Conflict exists only where there is division—between observer and observed, between fact and ideal, between what is and what should be. When division ends, conflict has no ground.

Q: And what is the result of such observation?

A: Energy. But not the energy born of effort, control, or resistance. Those are destructive energies. The energy that

comes from total seeing is quiet, non-fragmented, and intelligent.

Q: Why is this energy important?

A: Without it, the mind is mechanical, repetitive, and dull. With it, the mind is sensitive, alive, and capable of compassion. This energy is not something to be cultivated; it arises naturally when there is complete attention.

Q: Is seeing then a form of action?

A: Seeing is action. There is no interval between perception and action when perception is total. Action born of seeing has no regret, no contradiction, no violence.

Q: So, freedom lies in seeing facts as they are?

A: Freedom is the seeing of what is, without the interference of the 'me'. In that seeing, there is clarity. And where there is clarity, there is intelligence.

*****

Observing Disappointment

Krishnamurti would first ask: What is disappointment?
Not its cause, not how to overcome it, but what is actually taking place now.

Disappointment arises when an expectation is denied. Thought had projected an image—of success, recognition, affection, fairness—and when that image collapses, the mind reacts. The reaction is felt as heaviness, sadness, bitterness, or withdrawal. This reaction is disappointment.

To observe disappointment is to stay with the feeling without naming it as good or bad, without trying to escape from it, suppress it, explain it, or justify it. Most minds immediately move away from discomfort—by blaming others, blaming oneself, seeking consolation, or hoping it will pass. All such movements prevent observation.

Krishnamurti would say: Can you look at disappointment as it is, without the observer who wants it to end?

The observer is the 'me' who says, "I should not feel this," "This should not have happened," or "I must recover." That observer is part of the problem. Where the observer interferes, there is conflict.

When disappointment is observed without choice, something important happens. The mind sees not only the feeling, but also the structure behind it—expectation, image, comparison, and psychological demand. This seeing is not intellectual; it is factual.

In such observation, there is no separation between the observer and the observed. There is only the movement of disappointment being seen. When there is no division, there is no struggle.

Krishnamurti would emphasize that seeing is action. The moment disappointment is fully seen—without resistance or escape—it loses its grip. Not because it is pushed away, but because its root has been understood.

This does not mean the feeling is denied. It may still be present for a moment. But it no longer accumulates as resentment, memory, or self-pity. The mind is free to move on, unburdened.

So, observation is not:

- analysing disappointment,
- explaining its causes,
- correcting it,
- or replacing it with hope.

Observation is attention without motive.

In that attention, disappointment ends—not in time, but now.

***

Q: What is disappointment?

A: Disappointment arises when what is expected does not happen. Thought projects an image of the future, and when that image collapses, the mind reacts. That reaction is disappointment.

Q: Is disappointment caused by circumstances or by expectation?

A: Circumstances are facts. Disappointment is the psychological response to a fact not matching an image. Without expectation, there is no disappointment.

Q: When disappointment occurs, what usually happens inwardly?

A: The mind resists it. It seeks explanation, blames another or itself, justifies, escapes into hope, or suppresses the feeling. All these movements prevent understanding.

Q: Why do they prevent understanding?

A: Because they are escapes from the fact. They are attempts to get rid of discomfort rather than to see what is actually taking place.

Q: Then how should one observe disappointment?

A: Not how in the sense of a method. One observes by giving full attention to the feeling as it arises—without naming it, condemning it, or trying to alter it.

Q: What does it mean to observe without naming?

A: Naming is the past interfering with the present. When you say, "This is disappointment," memory immediately enters with all its associations. Observation then becomes partial.

Q: Is there an observer watching the disappointment?

A: The observer is thought—the 'me' who says, "I am disappointed and I must recover." That observer is part of the reaction. Where there is an observer separate from the observed, there is conflict.

Q: What happens when the observer does not interfere?

A: There is only the movement of disappointment being seen. No division. No struggle.

Q: Does such observation change the feeling?

A: Observation is not done to change anything. But when a fact is seen completely, without resistance, its structure is understood. In that understanding, the feeling loses its continuity.

Q: Are you saying disappointment ends through observation?

A: Yes—not in time, not gradually, but because the root has been seen. The root is expectation and image.

Q: But the feeling may still linger?

A: The sensation may pass naturally. What does not continue is the psychological accumulation—resentment, self-pity, or bitterness.

Q: So, observation is itself action?

A: Seeing is action. There is no gap between perception and action when perception is complete.

Q: What remains when disappointment is fully observed?

A: Clarity. A mind that is not burdened by what should have been. Such a mind deals with facts directly.

Q: Is that freedom?

A: Freedom is not from disappointment, but from the structure that creates it.

*****

When There Is No Comparison

Comparison is one of the most accepted and least questioned movements of the human mind. From childhood onward we are trained to measure ourselves against others—who is brighter, stronger, more successful, more spiritual. Society calls this measurement necessary, even healthy. Yet it is this very movement of comparison that breeds fear.

The moment the mind compares, it establishes a standard. There is what one is and what one should be; what one has and what another has; where one stands and where one imagines one must reach. In this gap between fact and ideal, fear is born. Fear of failure, fear of not becoming, fear of being inferior, fear of losing what one has gained. Comparison is never neutral; it is always charged with anxiety.

Through comparison, the mind constructs an image of itself. This image is shaped by praise and blame, success and failure. Once formed, it must be protected and improved. The protection of this image becomes the central occupation of the self. From this arise ambition, envy, competition, and the perpetual sense of insufficiency. The mind is no longer concerned with understanding what is; it is concerned with becoming something else.

Krishnamurti pointed out that comparison is a subtle form of violence. It divides human beings into superior and inferior, successful and unsuccessful, worthy and unworthy. Where there is division, there must be conflict—both outward and inward. Fear is the inevitable outcome of this conflict, for the image is always insecure and temporary.

To see the truth of this does not require analysis or gradual change. The ending of comparison does not come through will or discipline. One cannot decide to stop comparing. Such

a decision is still comparison in another form—the comparison between what is and what should be.

Comparison ends only when it is seen as it arises. When the mind becomes aware of measuring itself against another, without condemning or justifying that movement, the movement begins to lose its momentum. In that awareness there is no controller, no observer standing apart; there is only the fact of comparison being seen.

When comparison ends, fear ends—not as a result, but because the structure that sustains fear is no longer operating. Without measurement, there is no image to protect, no standard to live up to, no future achievement to pursue. The mind becomes quiet, not through effort, but through understanding.

In that quietness there is attention. Attention that is not centered on the self, that is not occupied with becoming. Such attention is free of fear because it is free of comparison. And where there is freedom from fear, there is intelligence.

Krishnamurti would say that a mind that does not compare is a mind that can learn. It is innocent, not burdened by the past, not projecting itself into the future. Such a mind does not seek security in measurement. It lives with what is, and in that living there is clarity.

Where there is no comparison, there is no fear. And where there is no fear, there is the possibility of a life that is compassionate, whole, and free.

*****

The illusion of control

Thought is always seeking continuity and security. When it feels disturbed, fragmented, or afraid, it invents a solution. It says, “I must be quiet,” “I must control my mind,” or “I must focus on one sacred idea and exclude all others.” This appears serious and disciplined, but it is still thought operating within its own field.

Krishnamurti would point out that the thought which says, “I must be quiet,” is itself noise. The controller is not separate from what it controls. The very effort to suppress other thoughts creates resistance, and resistance creates conflict. In this struggle, thought wanders and is pulled back again and again. This cycle is exhausting and futile.

When one thought is elevated and others are condemned, there is division. Whether the chosen thought is called God, truth, silence, or virtue makes no difference. The structure remains the same: one part of thought assumes authority over the rest. This authority is invented, not real.

In such discipline there is no freedom. There is only effort, fear of failure, and the desire to succeed. The mind becomes narrow, rigid, and repetitive. What is called concentration is merely exclusion, and exclusion dulls sensitivity.

Krishnamurti would insist that silence cannot be produced by thought. Thought can only create its opposite. True quietness comes when the whole movement of thought is seen clearly—its restlessness, its demand to control, its fear of emptiness. When this movement is observed without choosing, without resisting, without directing, thought naturally subsides.

Silence is not the result of discipline. It is the outcome of understanding. Where there is understanding, there is no battle. And where there is no battle, there is energy.

The ending of conflict is the beginning of clarity.

***

Questioner:
I try to quiet my mind, but it wanders constantly. So, I discipline it. I hold on to one thought—God, truth, or silence—and push the rest away. Is this not necessary?

Responder:
Who is it that is disciplining the mind?

Questioner:
I am.

Responder:
And what is this "I" made of?

Questioner:
Thought.

Responder:
Then thought is trying to control thought. One fragment sets itself up as the master and condemns the rest. Is that not so?

Questioner:
Yes, but without control the mind becomes chaotic.

Responder:
Is the chaos coming from lack of control—or from the conflict created by control?

Questioner:
I see that there is constant struggle. Thought wanders, and I pull it back again and again.

Responder:
And in that pulling back, is there peace—or only fatigue?

Questioner:
Only exhaustion.

Responder:
So, discipline, which you hoped would bring quietness, is itself the source of disturbance.

Questioner:
Then should I not concentrate at all?

Responder:
What you call concentration is exclusion. You select one thought and reject the rest. In rejection there is violence. In violence there can be no silence.

Questioner:
Then how is the mind to be quiet?

Responder:
Do not ask how. See what is actually happening. Observe the movement of thought that wants to control, suppress, and become something.

Questioner:
Observe without correcting?

Responder:

Without correcting, without condemning, without choosing. Just watch.

Questioner:
And what happens then?

Responder:
When the whole movement of thought is seen, without division between the observer and the observed, thought loses its authority. It has no ground on which to continue.

Questioner:
Is that silence?

Responder:
Silence is not something you achieve. It comes when conflict ends. And conflict ends when there is complete understanding, not effort.

Questioner:
So, the struggle to be quiet is the very thing that prevents quietness?

Responder:
Yes. Where there is no battle, there is energy. Where there is energy, there is clarity. And in clarity, the mind is naturally still.

*****

What Do I Do When I Am Confused?

Sir, when you ask,
“What do I do when I am confused?”
the very question reveals the nature of confusion.

Confusion exists only when the mind seeks a direction—
a way out,
a solution,
a path.

And the moment you ask,
“What should I do?”
you have already strengthened the confusion.

Let us inquire slowly, without rushing.

Confusion Happens When Thought Contradicts Itself

Thought itself is contradictory—
one desire pulling in one direction,
another desire pulling in the opposite.

One belief contradicting another belief.
One conclusion fighting another conclusion.

Confusion is not an external problem.
It is the nature of thought.

You feel confused
because thought is trying to straighten out the very disorder it created.

How can confusion clear confusion?

It is like asking the waves
to make the ocean still.

The Question "What Should I Do?" Keeps Confusion Alive

When you ask,
"What should I do?"
you want a method,
a conclusion,
a direction.

Any direction you take
comes from the same confused mind.

So, whatever you do
will only increase the confusion.

To search for clarity
is to move further into darkness.

This is a fact, sir—
not a philosophy.

Confusion Ends When You Stop Escaping from It

Usually, when confused,
we escape by:

- seeking advice,
- reading scriptures,
- asking friends,
- following gurus,
- clinging to beliefs,

- making decisions in haste,
- distracting ourselves.

Every escape strengthens the confusion.

Krishnamurti says:
Look at the confusion.
Stay with it.
Let it flower.

Do not run away from it.

Awareness Is the Ending of Confusion

What happens when you simply observe confusion?

You watch the mind wanting certainty,
wanting a solution,
wanting relief.

You watch its restlessness,
its fear of making a mistake,
its desire for quick answers.

When you observe without direction,
without wishing to change anything,
without wanting the confusion to end—
then the mind becomes extraordinarily quiet.

In that silence,
confusion reveals its structure.

It shows you its roots—
desire, fear, contradiction, pressure from society,
the burden of “should” and “should not.”

Seeing the whole of confusion
is the ending of confusion.

Confusion Ends When the Observer Ends

Confusion persists
as long as there is a “you”
who is confused and wants to escape.

The “you” is the thinker,
the centre,
the observer.

But the observer is the confusion—
a bundle of contradictory desires.

When you see that the observer
and the confusion
are not separate,
a remarkable thing happens:

The conflict ends.

In that ending there is clarity.

Not the clarity of decision,
but the clarity of perception.

Clarity Is Not a Choice; It Is a State of Seeing

You do not make clarity happen.
You do not work towards clarity.
You do not practise clarity.

Clarity comes
when the mind sees confusion as it is
without distortion.

Clarity is not the opposite of confusion.
Clarity is what remains
when confusion has been fully understood.

The Mind Becomes Clear When Thought Finds Its Right Place

Thought tries to solve psychological confusion,
but thought is the source of psychological confusion.

When thought sees its own limit,
it naturally becomes quiet.

In that quietness,
clarity blooms.

That clarity is intelligence.

Out of Clarity Comes Right Action

When the mind is clear,
action is simple, direct, effortless.

There is no conflict,
no regret,
no confusion.

Right action arises naturally
from clarity.

Not from fear,

not from pressure,
not from authority,
not from habit.

In clarity,
action is always right.

So, what do I do when I am confused?

You do nothing.

You look.
You observe.
You stay with the confusion
without escape,
without choice,
without resistance.

In that observation,
confusion unfolds.

When the mind sees confusion completely,
confusion ends.

And in that ending
there is clarity,
intelligence,
and freedom.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, what am I to do when I am confused?”

Questioner:

When I face a problem—
in work, in relationship, in thought—
my mind becomes confused.
I feel torn, uncertain, anxious.
In those moments, what should I do?

Teacher:
Sir, the moment you ask,
"What should I do?"
you have already moved away from the fact.

The fact is confusion.
But you are seeking a way out of it—
a solution,
a method,
an escape.

This escape is the continuation of confusion.

So before asking what to do,
let us understand what confusion is.

"Why does confusion arise at all?"

Questioner:
Yes, I would like to understand that.
Why does confusion come so easily?

Teacher:
Confusion arises
when thought wants certainty
in a situation where certainty is impossible.

Confusion arises
when desire pulls in one direction

and fear pulls in another.

Confusion arises
when the mind is burdened with
contradictory beliefs, memories, expectations.

The self itself is a bundle of contradictions.

So, it is not you who are confused—
it is the structure of thought that is confused.

Thought is born of memory,
and memory is always limited.

How can the limited
clarify the limitless complexities of life?

It cannot.

Therefore, thought is confused.

“So, confusion is not separate from me?”

Questioner:
But I feel I am confused.
There is a sense of “I” facing the confusion.
Is that also part of the confusion?

Teacher:
Of course.

The “I” is thought.
The “I” is the centre created by memory.

The “I” says,

“I am confused,”
as though the “I” was something apart,
stronger, wiser, clearer.

But the “I” is confusion.
It is made of the very same contradictions.

So, the division between “I” and “my confusion”
is false.

When you see this,
the struggle ends.

“But Sir, in that moment of confusion, I suffer. What do I do?”

Questioner:
When I am in the middle of confusion—
when I must decide something important—
I feel torn and anxious.
It is very painful.
What am I to do in that moment?

Teacher:
Sir, the moment you feel confusion,
the mind wants to run away.

It runs to:

- advice,
- books,
- authority,
- belief,
- quick decisions,
- distractions,
- explanations.

But any movement away from confusion
strengthens confusion.

Just observe this fact.

Escaping from confusion
is the nourishment of confusion.

“Are you saying I should remain confused?”

Questioner:
It sounds strange—
you are saying I should stay with confusion?
Not run away?

Teacher:
Stay with the fact.

Look at the confusion
as you would look at a living thing.

Do not condemn it,
do not justify it,
do not try to alter it.

Just watch it.

Watch the movement of thought
trying to escape.

Watch the fear of being wrong.

Watch the desire to find the right path.

Watch the whole restlessness of the mind.

This watching is awareness.

And awareness brings clarity.

Not time.
Not decision.
Not will-power.

Awareness alone.

“What does awareness reveal about confusion?”

Questioner:
What will I see
if I simply remain aware of confusion?

Teacher:
You will see the mechanics of the mind.

You will see how thought searches for security.
You will see how desire creates contradictory impulses.
You will see how fear demands a quick answer.
You will see how memory interferes.
You will see how the past dominates the present.

You will see, in fact,
how the whole structure of the self operates.

And the moment the mind sees the truth of this,
confusion begins to dissolve.

Not gradually—
instantly.

Insight ends confusion.

“Can confusion end without making a decision?”

Questioner:
Usually, I feel confusion ends
only when I make a choice—
one direction or another.
Are you saying confusion can end
without choosing?

Teacher:
Certainly.

Choice exists only when there is confusion.

When there is clarity,
there is no choice—
there is only action.

Choice implies conflict.
Conflict is confusion.

When the mind sees clearly,
action is spontaneous, immediate, accurate.

It is like seeing a snake—
you do not choose to move,
you simply move.

Clarity acts.

Confusion chooses.

“So, clarity is not something I can attain?”

Questioner:
How do I reach clarity then?
How do I cultivate it?

Teacher:
You cannot cultivate clarity.

Any cultivation is the action of the self
trying to become something.

Clarity comes
when the mind sees confusion completely—
as a whole.

As long as you want clarity,
you are still confused.

Wanting clarity
is the movement of the confused mind.

But when the mind sees the whole movement of confusion
without escaping,
without suppressing,
without condemning—

in that seeing,
confusion ends.

And what remains
is clarity.

“Does clarity stay permanently?”

Questioner:
Once confusion ends,
does clarity remain forever?

Teacher:
Sir, nothing of the mind remains forever.

Clarity is alive,
living.

The moment you try to hold it,
it becomes memory,
which is the past,
which is thought,
which again brings confusion.

Live with awareness each moment—
not with the hope of continuity,
but with a freshness that does not accumulate.

The Dialogue Ends in Stillness

Teacher spoke slowly:

Confusion ends
when you understand it.

Not when you resist it.
Not when you run away.
Not when you seek guidance.

To be aware of confusion
without choice
is the beginning of intelligence.

In that intelligence,
there is clarity.
And from clarity,
action is always right.

The group sat without movement—
each person listening inwardly,
not to the speaker,
but to the silence that followed.

*****

Pleasure vs. Joy

Sir, to understand the difference between pleasure and joy
is to understand the very root of human suffering.
For most of us, these two words appear similar—
but inwardly they belong to two entirely different worlds.

Let us look at this carefully, not theoretically,
but as something alive in our own hearts.

Pleasure Is the Pursuit of Experience

Pleasure begins with sensation—
a taste, a touch, a sound, a word, a memory.
Sensation becomes pleasure
when thought enters
and says:

- "I want this again."
- "How wonderful that was."
- "Let it not end."

Thought remembers pleasure
and seeks its repetition.

But repetition is never the original.
So, pleasure demands more:

more excitement,
more stimulation,
more fulfilment.

Pleasure always asks for continuation.

And when continuation is not possible—

as is the nature of all things—
pain begins.

Pleasure and pain are two sides of the same movement.

Pleasure Is the Demand for More

Pleasure depends on becoming:

- becoming happier,
- becoming more satisfied,
- becoming more entertained,
- becoming more fulfilled.

It is always looking outward
to gain something
or inward to recreate a memory.

Pleasure is self-centred.
It revolves around the "me."

The "me" seeks pleasure.
Pleasure strengthens the "me."

Where the "me" is active,
there is fear,
possessiveness,
jealousy,
dependence.

Thus, pleasure inevitably leads to conflict.

Joy Has No Cause

Joy is something entirely different.

Joy is not the result of anything.
It has no motive,
no memory,
no direction.

Joy happens when the mind is utterly present—
when there is no seeking,
no wanting,
no becoming.

Joy comes unexpectedly:

- in the quiet beauty of a sunset,
- in the laughter of a child,
- in the stillness of early dawn,
- in the simple act of being attentive.

In those moments
you are not thinking about yourself.

You are not saying,
"I must hold onto this,"
or
"Let this continue."

Joy is free of the past
and free of the future.

Joy is timeless.

Pleasure Is of Thought; Joy Is of Awareness

Pleasure comes through thought:

Thought remembers.
Thought anticipates.

Thought pursues.

Joy is outside the movement of thought.

Joy is born in awareness:

a mind that is open,
sensitive,
without barrier,
without fear.

Where there is awareness,
there is beauty.

Where there is beauty,
there is joy.

Joy does not belong to the self.
It blooms when the self is absent.

Pleasure Creates Dependency; Joy Is Freedom

Pleasure binds you to things,
to people,
to habits,
to circumstances.

It says:

“I need this to be happy.”
“I need him.”
“I need her.”
“I need that experience again.”

Dependence brings fear—
fear of loss,

fear of change,
fear of insecurity.

Joy depends on nothing.

Joy is free.

Joy does not seek continuity.
It does not cling.

It comes like a breeze,
and like a breeze,
it moves on.

Pleasure Demands Stimulation; Joy Exists in Simplicity

Pleasure needs excitement:

more sensation,
more imagination,
more entertainment.

The mind becomes restless,
frenzied,
always chasing the next thing.

Joy exists in simplicity:

in a clear sky,
in the movement of trees,
in the smile of a stranger,
in silence,
in understanding oneself.

Pleasure is noisy.
Joy is quiet.

Pleasure burns itself out.

Joy renews itself eternally.

Pleasure Strengthens the Ego; Joy Dissolves It

Pleasure says:

“I enjoyed.”
“I want.”
“I must have.”
“This is mine.”

The ego becomes thicker,
heavier,
more demanding.

Joy has no owner.

In joy there is no “I.”

There is only the state of joy.

It is a moment of egolessness—
and therefore, a moment of great beauty,
great compassion.

Pleasure Ends; Joy Cannot End

Pleasure always ends—
and the ending brings disappointment.

Because thought seeks the past,
it wants pleasure to continue.

But nothing continues.
Nothing remains.

The seeking of continuity
creates fear and sorrow.

Joy does not ask for continuation.
It is enough in the moment.

And because it does not seek continuance,
it has an infinite freshness.

Joy is new every time.

So, what is the difference, truly?

Pleasure is born of thought; joy is born of awareness.

Pleasure depends on repetition; joy has no repetition.

Pleasure strengthens the self; joy dissolves the self.

Pleasure leads to conflict; joy flowers in freedom.

Pleasure is noisy; joy is silent.

Pleasure ends; joy is timeless.

And to see this clearly—
to see pleasure as it is,
without condemning it or indulging it—
is already the beginning of joy.

Joy is the perfume of a mind
that is free.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, why does pleasure dominate our lives while joy seems so rare?”

Questioner:
Every human being seems driven by the pursuit of pleasure—
in relationships, work, religion, entertainment.
But joy feels delicate, momentary, almost accidental.
Why does pleasure dominate us so completely
while joy appears only in flashes?

Teacher:
Sir, pleasure dominates because it can be repeated.
Joy cannot.

Pleasure comes through sensation,
and sensation can be remembered.

Thought says, "That was pleasant—let me have more."
Thought stores it, nourishes it,
projects it into the future.

Pleasure is continuity.

Joy is not.

Joy has no continuity,
no desire to continue,
no thought that pursues it.

Pleasure lives in time.
Joy lives only in the moment.

"But is pleasure itself wrong? Why do saints warn against it?"

Questioner:
Religions often condemn pleasure,

as though pleasure itself is sinful.
Is pleasure wrong?

Teacher:
It is not a question of right or wrong.
Let us put aside all moral condemnations.

Pleasure becomes a problem
only when it becomes a psychological dependency—
when you must have it.

You see, sir, pleasure is not the original sensation:
the taste of food,
the warmth of sunlight,
the beauty of a face.

Pleasure begins
when thought interferes
and says,

"I want this again."
"How can I keep it?"
"It must not end."

The clinging is the problem,
not the sensation.

"Why do we cling to pleasure at all?"

Questioner:
If clinging creates suffering,
why does thought cling to pleasure so much?

Teacher:
Because the self is built out of remembrance.

Pleasure strengthens the sense of “me.”
The “me” feels expanded,
energised,
heightened in moments of pleasure.

So thought says,
“I must continue this feeling
in order to continue myself.”

Thus, pleasure becomes a psychological necessity,
and with necessity comes fear.

Fear that it may fade.
Fear that someone may take it away.
Fear that you may never experience it again.

Pleasure inevitably breeds fear.

“Does joy also strengthen the self?”

Questioner:
Sometimes in joy
I feel larger than myself—
more open, more connected.
Does joy also expand the self?

Teacher:
Quite the opposite.

In joy the self is absent.

In joy,
there is no observer saying,
“I am joyful.”

The moment the self says that,
joy has already ended
and turned into pleasure in memory.

Joy is a flame without smoke.

Pleasure is a flame
that constantly fears being extinguished.

Joy dissolves the self.
Pleasure reinforces it.

“If joy dissolves the self, is joy dangerous to the ego?”

Questioner:
Then is joy something the self resists?
Does the ego fear joy?

Teacher:
Yes, sir, because joy brings freedom.
And freedom is dangerous to the self.

The self survives only in continuity—
the continuity of thought,
memory,
pleasure,
fear,
ambition.

Joy interrupts that continuity.

In moments of joy
you do not think of your problems,
your name,

your achievements,
your desires.

You simply are—
without the “me.”

So, the self cannot use joy
to build itself further.

Therefore, joy rarely visits a mind
that clings to itself.

“Can one cultivate joy?”

Questioner:
If joy is so precious,
can we cultivate it through practice or meditation?

Teacher:
The cultivation of joy
is the cultivation of illusion.

You can cultivate memory,
skill,
discipline—
but not joy.

Joy appears when the mind is quiet—
not made quiet,
but quiet because it has understood itself.

Joy comes when the heart is free of burden,
when thought does not interfere.

Joy is a by-product

of a mind that sees clearly.

You cannot chase joy.
You can only understand the things
that prevent it.

“What prevents joy?”

Questioner:
What exactly blocks joy in our daily living?

Teacher:
Fear, sir.
Fear of loss,
fear of uncertainty,
fear of not becoming something.

Also ambition—
the constant drive to be better,
to be more important,
to be somebody.

Comparison prevents joy.
Jealousy prevents joy.
Attachment prevents joy—
because attachment is fear hidden behind affection.

Where the self is active,
joy cannot flower.

Joy is the perfume
of freedom.

“Is pleasure always harmful?”

Questioner:
If pleasure binds us and creates fear,
should we avoid all pleasure?

Teacher:
Avoidance is as foolish as indulgence.

What matters is understanding.

When you see pleasure clearly—
its nature,
its movement,
its consequences—
it finds its rightful place.

Pleasure is natural,
but not central.

Its right place is in the body,
not in the mind.

When pleasure becomes a psychological pursuit,
it becomes suffering.

When it remains a simple sensation,
it is harmless.

Understanding gives it order.

“Is joy related to love?”

Questioner:
Is joy connected with love?
Or are they different?

Teacher:
Where there is love,
there is joy.
They are born of the same silence.

Love is not desire.
Love is not attachment.
Love is not the pleasure of possession.

Love is the absence of the self.

Joy also is the absence of the self.

Thus, love and joy are inseparable.

Love is the vast sky.
Joy is its sunlight.

“How do I discover joy in daily living?”

Questioner:
How can an ordinary person,
with responsibilities and fears,
come upon joy in everyday life?

Teacher:
Begin with awareness.

Be aware of the movement of pleasure—
how it arises,
how thought pursues it,
how fear follows.

Be aware of how the self seeks continuity.
Be aware of every desire that whispers, “More.”

Awareness is like a light.
In that light,
pleasure is seen in its own place
and does not overflow into the psychological field.

Then the mind becomes quiet,
naturally,
without forcing.

And in that quietness,
joy blossoms—
as a flower opens when the night is over.

Joy is not something you bring about.
It comes when you are not looking for it.

The Dialogue Ends in Silence

Teacher spoke softly:

Pleasure belongs to thought
and therefore, to time.
It is bound to fear.

Joy belongs to awareness
and is timeless.
It is bound to love.

To understand pleasure completely
is to invite joy.

Not by asking for it,
not by seeking it,
but by seeing the self for what it is.

In that seeing,
joy walks in—
unannounced,
unclaimed,
immeasurable.

A long silence followed,
as if the very air had become aware of itself.

*****

Is It Possible to Look with All Your Senses Together?

To Look with All Your Senses — In the Spirit of JK

Sir, when Krishnamurti speaks of looking with all your senses—
he is pointing to something far more profound
than mere sensory perception.

It is a doorway
into a totally different dimension of awareness.

Let us explore it slowly.

We Usually Look in Fragments

When you look at a tree,
what is actually happening?

You look with your eyes,
but your mind is elsewhere:

- thinking,
- comparing,
- naming,
- remembering,
- judging.

Your body sees the tree,
but your mind sees the word “tree,”
the image of a tree,
the memories associated with trees.

Thus, the seeing is partial.

Fragmented.

There is no wholeness in perception.

Looking With All Your Senses Means Total Attention

To look with all your senses together
is to look with:

- the eyes fully awake,
- the ears fully listening,
- the skin sensitive to the breeze,
- the breath quiet,
- the heart attentive,
- the mind silent.

It is to be completely present.

This presence is not forced,
not cultivated,
not disciplined.

It happens naturally
when the mind is not distracted by thought.

When you look with all your senses,
there is no centre saying “I am looking.”

The “I” disappears.

Only perception remains.

When All the Senses Operate Together, Thought Falls Silent

Thought cannot operate in the field of total perception.

Thought can comment,
compare,
judge,
name.

But when all your senses come alive,
thought has no space.

It becomes quiet.

Not through suppression,
not through control,
but because there is no movement of the "me"
seeking, resisting, protecting.

The silence is natural.

This silence is awareness.

Looking With All Your Senses Is Not an Effort

One cannot try to look with all senses:

"Let me hear more intensely."
"Let me feel more deeply."
"Let me smell, taste, touch everything."

That is not total seeing.
That is effort,
and effort comes from the self.

Total sensing is effortless.

It happens the moment you drop:

- distraction,
- desire,
- fear,
- comparison,
- thought.

It is the same effortless attention
you have when danger appears—

you hear, see, and act instantly
—all senses together.

No division.

No thought.

Only pure perception.

In Total Sensory Perception There Is Great Beauty

When you look at a flower
with all your senses awake,
you are not naming it,
you are not comparing it to yesterday's flower,
you are not wanting it,
you are not analysing it.

You are simply with it.

In that state,
the separation between observer and observed dissolves.

There is a sense of wholeness,
of communion,

of intimacy with life.

This wholeness is beauty.

Beauty is not in the object alone.
Beauty is in the harmonious functioning
of a mind without division.

Looking With All Your Senses Brings Order to the Mind

When all your senses function together,
the nervous system is fully awake,
yet completely still.

There is no conflict,
no struggle,
no contradiction.

Such a mind is orderly,
not because it forces itself into order,
but because disorder (conflict) is not present.

This order is intelligence.

Intelligence is not thought.
Intelligence is the clarity that arises
when perception is whole.

Looking With All Senses Is a Doorway to the Sacred

In that moment of total sensing:

- the “me” is absent,
- time is absent,
- thought is silent,
- the mind is utterly still.

In that stillness,

there is a sense of the immeasurable—
a sacredness that cannot be described.

It is not something mystical or esoteric.
It is the natural flowering
of a mind that is whole.

To look with all your senses
is to touch the sacred.

So, what does it mean?

To look with all your senses is to look without the ‘me’.

It is to be wholly present, wholly alive.

It is choiceless awareness.

It is the ending of fragmentation.

It is the awakening of intelligence.

It is the doorway to the sacred.

When you look this way—
at a bird,
a tree,
a child,
the sky,
your own thoughts—
you are in direct relationship with life.

Such looking is love.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, is it really possible to look with all one’s senses at the same time?”

Questioner:
When you say we must look with all our senses,
it sounds extraordinary.
Most of us look with our eyes,
sometimes we listen,
sometimes we touch—
but all together?
Is that truly possible?

Teacher:
Sir, do you notice something?
We rarely look at anything at all.
We glance,
we name,
we compare,
we think about what we see—
but we do not look.

To look with all your senses
is to look with your whole being.

It is to look without the movement of thought.

Let us explore this together.

“Why don’t we naturally look this way?”

Questioner:
If this is natural,
why are we unable to look with such wholeness?

Teacher:
Because our senses are divided
by the constant chatter of the mind.

When you look at a tree,
your mind says:

“That is a neem tree.”
“I saw one like this last week.”
“I must water the garden.”
“How green it is,
I wish my house had more trees.”

The word,
the image,
the memory,
the comparison
—all of this stands between you and the tree.

So, the looking becomes partial.

Thought is always interfering.

“So thought prevents total perception?”

Questioner:
Are you saying thought is the obstruction?

Teacher:
Thought divides the senses.

Thought says:
“This is important, that is not.”
“Look here, not there.”
“Pay attention to this, ignore that.”

Thought fragments perception.

But perception itself—
the natural state of the senses—
is whole.

When the senses are fully awake,
fully alert,
fully alive,
thought has no place.

You cannot think and totally perceive
at the same moment.

“What does it mean to sense fully?”

Questioner:
What is the quality of this fullness?
How does it feel?

Teacher:
When you look at a flower
with all your senses—

the colour,
the scent,
the delicate texture,
the surrounding space,
the light that falls upon it—

you are not just seeing with the eyes.
The ear is also listening to the breeze around it.
The skin feels the warmth of the sun.
The whole nervous system is sensitive.

All your senses are functioning together—
not separately.

In that moment,
the “me” who says,
“I am looking,”
is absent.

There is only perception.

Only the flower.

Only the act of seeing.

This is fullness.

“Is this fullness the same as attention?”

Questioner:
Is this the attention you speak of so often?

Teacher:
Yes.

Attention is the state
in which all the senses are awake simultaneously.

Attention is not concentration.
Concentration excludes;
attention includes.

When you look with all your senses,
you are completely attentive—
not because you force yourself,
but because nothing is escaping your awareness.

Attention is wholeness.
Wholeness is beauty.

“Does this mean the observer disappears?”

Questioner:
When I try this,
there is still a sense of “I am watching the tree.”
How does one end that observer?

Teacher:
You cannot end the observer.

But if you look deeply,
you will see that the observer
is the movement of thought.

The observer says:
“I like this.”
“I don’t like that.”
“This is mine.”
“That reminds me of something.”

Where there is comparison,
there is the observer.

Where there is judgement,
there is the observer.

But when all the senses awaken together,
thought becomes silent.

In that silence,
there is no observer.

There is only observation.

The mind becomes like a clear mirror.

“Does looking with all senses bring a different kind of perception?”

Questioner:
Does it change the way we understand the world?

Teacher:
Completely.

When you look partially,
you misunderstand life.
You see fragments,
not the whole.

But when all the senses are alive—
there is a perception that is immediate,
direct,
undistorted.

It is like looking at the sky
on a clear, windless morning.

There is no haze.

This clarity is intelligence.

"Can this total perception be applied to oneself?"

Questioner:
If I can look at a tree this way,
can I also look at myself
with all my senses?

Teacher:
Indeed, sir.

To look at yourself totally—
your reactions,
your fears,
your ambitions,
your hurts—
is to look without the observer.

If you look at yourself
with all your senses awake,
you will not condemn,
you will not justify,

you will not compare.

You will simply see.

And this seeing transforms.

The seeing itself is the action.

“Does this lead to silence?”

Questioner:
Does total sensing bring silence to the mind?

Teacher:
Yes.

Not the silence of suppression,
not the silence of control,
but a natural silence—
the silence that comes
when the whole mind is attentive.

A mind that is wholly attentive
is still,
unburdened,
vibrant.

In that stillness
there is a sense of great beauty,
great love,
great compassion.

This silence is the foundation of the sacred.

The Dialogue Ends in Quietness

Teacher said gently:

To look with all your senses
is to look without the past.

It is to look without the “me.”
It is to see life as it actually is—
not as memory shapes it.

This seeing is wholeness.
This wholeness is beauty.
This beauty is the expression of love.

When all the senses awaken,
the heart awakens.

And in that awakening
lies a freedom
that thought can never touch.

The group remained silent,
as if experiencing the fullness
of sensing the rain.

*****

You Must Be Free to Look

Sir, to look—to truly look—
is one of the simplest acts in life.
Yet for most of us,
it is also the most difficult.

We believe we see clearly,
but in actuality our seeing is clouded—
by fear, by memory, by prejudice,
by belief, by expectation,
by the images we carry about ourselves and others.

Krishnamurti says:

You must be free to look.

Not free after looking,
not free someday in the future—
but free before the act of seeing.

Let us go into this carefully.

Looking Is Distorted by the Past

When you look at a person,
you rarely see the person.

You see:

- your memories of them,
- your hurts,
- your hopes,
- your disappointments,
- your conclusions,

- your image of what they are.

These memories stand between you and what is.

Between the eye and the fact
stands the past.

So, the seeing becomes recognition—
and recognition is not perception.

To look freely
is to look without the burden of yesterday.

You Cannot Look Freely with Fear in the Mind

Fear narrows the field of perception.

A frightened mind sees only
what confirms its insecurity.
It avoids what threatens its beliefs.
It resists what challenges its comfort.

Fear says:

“I must protect myself.”
“I must be careful.”
“I must not be hurt again.”

This self-protection
becomes a wall around perception.

When fear is present,
freedom is absent.

And without freedom,

there is no looking.

Belief Prevents Free Seeing

When you look through belief—
religious, political, social—
your seeing is already conditioned.

Belief decides what you should see,
what you must not see,
what is allowed,
what is forbidden.

Belief whispers,
“This is true,”
“This is false,”
before you have even looked.

Belief blinds.

One cannot look freely
through the screen of belief.

Desire Also Distorts Seeing

Desire pushes the mind forward—
toward pleasure, toward fulfilment.

The mind sees
only what it wants to see.

A desiring mind does not look.
It seeks.

To look freely,

desire must quiet itself.

Not be suppressed—
but understood.

Because desire, too, is a movement of thought.

And thought, however refined,
cannot look freely.

Freedom to Look Means Looking Without a Centre

When you say,
“I am looking,”
the “I” becomes the centre
around which all seeing revolves.

The “I” interprets,
chooses,
rejects,
compares.

Therefore, the seeing is not free.

In choiceless awareness
there is no centre.

There is only the act of seeing.

When the observer ends,
looking becomes direct,
immediate,
whole.

Freedom to Look Means No Motive

If you look to gain something—
a result,
an insight,
a reward,
an answer—
then your motive shapes what you see.

Motive is a form of desire.

Motive limits.

Motive says:

"I will look
only if I get something from it."

Such looking is never free.

Real looking has no motive.

It is pure attention.

You Must Be Free to Look at Yourself

The most difficult task
is to look at oneself freely.

To look at your fear without wanting to escape.
To look at your ambition without justifying it.
To look at your loneliness without seeking comfort.
To look at your hurt without blaming others.

To look at "what is"
without distortion.

This requires tremendous honesty.

When you look freely at yourself,
the fact reveals its whole structure.

And in this revelation,
there is transformation.

Seeing is doing.

Freedom to Look Is the Foundation of Intelligence

A mind that is free to look
is a mind that learns—
not from books,
not from authorities,
but from the direct observation of life.

Such learning is intelligence.

Intelligence is not memory,
not knowledge,
not cleverness.

Intelligence is the sensitivity
to see the true and the false instantly.

And you can see the false
only when you are free to look.

Freedom to Look Is the Beginning of Love

When you look at another human being
without judgement,

without the past,
without comparison,
without wanting something—
there is great beauty in that seeing.

That seeing is love.

Love cannot coexist with images.
Love cannot coexist with fear.
Love cannot coexist with desire.

Love is the flowering
of a mind that is free.

So, what does it mean:

"You must be free to look"?

It means:

- Free from the past.
- Free from fear.
- Free from belief.
- Free from desire.
- Free from motive.
- Free from the observer.
- Free from psychological time.

Only such a mind
can look at life,
at the world,
at another human being,
and at itself—
with clarity.

Freedom is not the result of looking.

It is the beginning of looking.

When you are free to look,
you meet life directly—
without distortion.

In that direct perception
lies the seed of intelligence,
of compassion,
of transformation.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, what do you mean when you say we must be free to look?”

Questioner:
You often say, “You must be free to look.”
But what does that mean?
I look at the world every day—
I see people, objects, nature.
I observe my thoughts.
What is the freedom you speak of?

Teacher:
Madam, to look merely with the eyes
is not to look.

We see objects,
but we do not truly perceive.

We look through:

- memories,
- judgements,

- fears,
- hopes,
- conclusions.

So, the looking is never fresh.
It is always coloured by the past.

To be free to look
is to look without the weight of yesterday.

“Are you saying that memory interferes with perception?”

Questioner:
But memory is necessary, is it not?
Without it we cannot recognise anything.

Teacher:
Memory is necessary for practical things—
how to drive a car,
the way home,
the language we are speaking.

But psychological memory—
the image I have about you
and the image you have about me—
that is what interferes.

When I meet you next time,
I do not meet you—
I meet the image I have built.

The image looks,
not the mind.

So, I am never free to look.

“But how can I look at someone without the image?”

Questioner:
Is it even possible?
Aren’t images natural?

Teacher:
Images are natural only
when the mind is not aware.

The moment you become aware
that the mind is forming an image—
the very seeing of it ends the process.

Awareness is freedom.

To look at someone without the image
is to meet them anew—
as though for the first time.

Such looking has immense freshness.

Without freedom,
one cannot look in this way.

“What prevents us from looking freely?”

Questioner:
What blocks this freedom?

Teacher:
Fear, madam.
Fear is the greatest distortion.

A frightened mind
does not see what is—
it sees what it hopes for,
or what it dreads.

Fear makes the mind cling
to belief,
to authority,
to conclusions—
seeking security.

The mind that seeks security
cannot look freely
because it is always choosing what it wants to see.

To be free to look,
fear must end.

“How does fear end?”

Questioner:
This seems impossible.
Fear is so deep—
from childhood onward.
How does one end fear
in order to look freely?

Teacher:
Fear ends
when you see its movement completely.

Fear is thought—
thought imagining the future,
thought recalling the past,

thought seeking protection.

If you watch fear without trying to escape,
without naming it,
without resisting it—
then thought ends its interference.

In that moment of pure observation,
fear dissolves.

Where fear ends,
freedom begins.

“Is desire also a hindrance to looking freely?”

Questioner:
Desire seems so strong.
Does it distort perception?

Teacher:
Of course.

Desire narrows the mind
to a single direction.

When you want something—
a result,
a reward,
a particular outcome—
you are no longer looking.

You are projecting.

You are chasing.

A mind that is seeking
cannot see clearly.

Freedom to look
means freedom from desire's interference.

Not the ending of natural physical desires—
but freedom from psychological craving.

"What about belief? Does belief distort looking?"

Questioner:
Religion tells us how to look at life—
through a belief,
a doctrine,
a system.
Do these prevent free perception?

Teacher:
Belief prevents perception.

Belief says:

"This is the truth."
"You must see it this way."

Belief becomes the lens
through which the mind interprets everything.

A mind anchored in belief
is never free to look.

The believer looks through the screen of authority—
not through direct perception.

To see clearly,
the mind must be free of belief—
free of the need to believe.

Truth does not require belief.
It requires clarity
and freedom.

“What is this freedom you speak of?”

Questioner:
This freedom—
is it freedom from society?
Freedom from responsibilities?
Freedom from what?

Teacher:
I am not speaking of freedom
to do what you like.

I am speaking of inward freedom.

Freedom from:

- fear,
- hurt,
- the image of yourself,
- the image of others,
- comparison,
- ambition,
- desire,
- belief,
- conditioning.

When the mind is free inwardly,
it meets the world

without distortion.

This is the freedom needed
to look.

“Does this free looking transform action?”

Questioner:
If one looks freely,
does it change one’s actions?

Teacher:
Yes, sir.
Action born of clarity
is very different from action born of confusion.

When you look freely—

you see yourself as you are.
You see your relationships as they are.
You see conflict as it is,
without excuses.

And this seeing is action.

Seeing the truth of something
brings its own transformation.

There is no need for will,
no need for control,
no need for effort.

The very act of seeing
is the ending of conflict.

“Is looking with freedom the beginning of love?”

Questioner:
Is this way of looking
connected to love?

Teacher:
Of course, madam.

When you look at another
without the past,
without judgement,
without expectation,
without images—

there is affection,
care,
sensitivity.

Love is not sentiment or romance.
Love is the freedom to look at another
as they actually are.

Love is the absence of the self.

A mind that is free to look
is a mind that can love.

The Dialogue Ends in Quietness

Teacher spoke very quietly:

To look,
you must be free.

Free from the past,
free from fear,
free from desire,
free from belief,
free from the image,
free from the self.

Such freedom
is not at the end of looking—
it is at the beginning.

And in this freedom
lies the beauty of perception,
the clarity of intelligence,
the tenderness of love.

The group remained still for a long time—
not thinking,
but listening inwardly
to the silence that follows understanding.

*****

Die Every Day

Sir, when Krishnamurti says,
“Die every day,”
he is not speaking of physical death.
He is pointing to something far more profound—
a psychological dying,
a dying to the known,
a dying to yesterday.

To die every day
is to live without the burden of the past.

Let us explore this slowly, carefully,
without conclusion.

The Past Lives Through Memory and Thought

For most of us,
life is a continuity of memory:

- hurts from yesterday,
- pleasures we chase again,
- habits, beliefs, conclusions,
- our image of ourselves,
- our fears, our wounds,
- the psychological residue of every experience.

This accumulated past
controls the present
and shapes the future.

We do not live—
we merely repeat.

Thought then says,
“This continuity is me.”

But this “me” is nothing but time—
time as memory.

To die every day
is to end this continuity.

Dying Every Day Means Ending Attachment to Yesterday

We cling to memories—
both pleasant and painful—
as though they give us identity.

We say:

“My achievement defines me.”
“My sorrow shaped me.”
“My experience makes me who I am.”

This attachment creates fear—
fear of losing,
fear of changing,
fear of stepping into the unknown.

To die every day
is to let go of everything psychological
that you carry:

- your successes,
- your failures,
- your hurts,
- your conclusions,
- your sense of importance,

- your sense of inadequacy.

To die is to let the past end completely
at the end of each day.

Dying Every Day Is Ending the Self Each Day

The self—the "me"—
is the centre of continuity.

It is built by:

- thought,
- desire,
- fear,
- comparison,
- memory.

To die every day
is to see the self in operation
and let it end in real time.

Not suppressing it,
not controlling it,
not escaping from it.

Seeing it clearly
and letting it dissolve in awareness.

When the "me" ends,
even for a moment,
there is an extraordinary sense of freshness,
renewal,
innocence.

This is dying psychologically.

Dying Every Day Is the Ending of Hurt

Every hurt you carry
is a form of psychological continuity.

You are hurt once—
but you keep hurting yourself
by remembering it.

To die every day
is to end hurt as it arises—
not letting it take root,
not making an identity out of it.

In such dying,
there is immense freedom.

A mind that dies to hurt
cannot be wounded.

It is invulnerable
because it is fresh.

Dying Every Day Is the Ending of Pleasure's Grip

Pleasure remembered
becomes desire.
Desire becomes pursuit.
Pursuit becomes frustration and fear.

Pleasure then becomes a prison.

To die every day
is to let pleasure end

the moment it occurs—
not carry it over,
not repeat it in thought,
not chase it tomorrow.

Pleasure ends
and you end it.

Then you are free.

Dying Every Day Means Ending Every Conclusion

The mind is endlessly accumulating:

"I know myself."
"I know what life is."
"I know how things work."
"I know the right path."

These conclusions become walls around perception.

To die every day
is to end every conclusion—
to begin each day with a mind
that does not assume,
does not expect,
does not cling.

A mind that dies to conclusion
is a mind that is free to learn.

In Dying, There Is Complete Living

It may sound contradictory,
but to die every day

is to live totally.

A mind carrying yesterday
cannot meet today.

It lives in shadows.

But a mind that dies to the past
is fully alive,
fully awake,
completely present.

Such a mind is fresh
like a morning after rain.

It sees beauty
as though for the first time.

It listens with all senses awake.
It lives without fear
because fear is born from continuity.

Dying Every Day Is the Beginning of Love

Where the self ends,
love begins.

Love cannot carry yesterday's wounds.
It cannot be continuity of pleasure.
It cannot exist where memory interferes.

Love is always new—
renewed in each moment.

To die every day

is to allow love to be born every day.

Love is not the memory of affection.
Love is not attachment.
Love is not sentiment.

Love is the freshness of a mind
that has died to itself.

Dying Every Day Is the Door to the Sacred

When the mind dies to time—
to the psychological past—
it enters a different dimension of being.

There is a silence
that is not the silence of effort.
There is a stillness
that is not the stillness of discipline.
There is a vastness
that cannot be touched by thought.

This sacredness
is encountered only
by a mind that dies every day.

A mind that clings
cannot touch the immeasurable.

So, what does “Die Every Day” truly mean?

It means:

- Die to hurt.
- Die to fear.
- Die to pleasure’s memory.

- Die to ambition and comparison.
- Die to your image of yourself.
- Die to others' images of you.
- Die to every psychological accumulation.

To die every day
is to be reborn every day—
fresh, innocent,
untouched by time.

It is the essence of meditation.
It is the essence of intelligence.
It is the essence of freedom.

***

A Dialogue

"Sir, what does it mean to die every day?"

Questioner:
You once said, "Die every day."
It is a startling phrase.
We usually think of death with fear, with sorrow.
What does it mean to die daily?

Teacher:
Sir, physical death comes inevitably.
But I am not speaking of that.

I am speaking of psychological death—
the ending of the burdens you carry,
the ending of memory as a continuation of the self,
the ending of hurt,
pleasure,
fear,

ambition.

To die every day
is to let the past end completely.

Then the mind is fresh,
untouched,
new.

“Why should the past end? Doesn’t it make us who we are?”

Questioner:
We are shaped by our past, our experiences.
If the past ends, what remains of us?

Teacher:
That is precisely the illusion, sir.

The past does not make you who you are.
The past prevents you from being what you are.

Your hurts, your pleasures, your beliefs—
these are not you.
They are residues of thought.

When the mind clings to these residues
it lives in yesterday,
not in the living present.

So long as the past dominates,
you never meet life directly.

To die every day
is to end the psychological continuity

that suffocates the mind.

“But how can we end the past? We cannot erase memory.”

Questioner:
Memory is there—
how can it simply stop?

Teacher:
We are not talking of practical memory—
how to drive a car,
how to speak a language.

We are speaking of psychological memory—
the memory of insult,
the memory of pleasure,
the memory of status,
the memory of what you think you are.

These memories create the “me.”

And the “me” clings to continuity.

To die every day
is to see the movement of this “me”
and let it end in that seeing.

Not suppress it,
not fight it,
but see it completely.

Seeing the truth of something
ends it.

“Is dying every day the same as letting go?”

Questioner:
Is this simply a form of letting go of the past?

Teacher:
Letting go implies someone who lets go—
a controller, an observer.

That observer is the past.

So, letting go is still part of continuity.

Dying every day
is not an act performed by the self.

It is the naturally occurring death
of something that is seen to be false.

When you see clearly that anger is destructive,
the seeing ends it instantly.

That ending is dying to anger.

Such dying is not effort—
it is insight.

“What does one die to?”

Questioner:
Could you explain what exactly we are dying to?

Teacher:
You die to:

- hurt,

- fear,
- ambition,
- envy,
- comparison,
- the image of yourself,
- the images you have about others,
- the pursuit of pleasure,
- your deepest beliefs,
- your most cherished conclusions.

Each of these creates continuity.

To die to them
is to end continuity.

Without continuity,
there is innocence.

“Is dying every day painful?”

Questioner:
Ending attachment, ending conclusions—
it seems painful.
Is this dying harsh?

Teacher:
Pain arises only
when there is resistance.

When you see a fact clearly—
for example,
that comparison destroys you—
is there pain in ending comparison?

Or is there clarity?

Truth never causes pain.
It is the self that clings
which experiences pain.

When there is no clinging,
dying is as natural as breathing.

Like a leaf falling from a tree—
effortless.

“Does dying every day free the mind from fear?”

Questioner:
Fear shapes so much of our lives.
Does daily dying end fear?

Teacher:
Fear is always about something—
losing what you have,
not getting what you want,
being hurt again.

Fear exists
because there is psychological continuity.

Dying every day
ends that continuity.

When you die to hurt,
hurt cannot continue as fear.

When you die to pleasure,
there is no fear of losing it.

When you die to the image of yourself,
there is no fear of being diminished.

In dying there is freedom.

“Is this dying connected to love?”

Questioner:
Can one love if one carries the past?

Teacher:
You cannot.

Love is not the continuity of memory.
Love is not attachment,
not sentiment,
not remembrance.

Love is the freshness of a mind
that has died to yesterday.

When you die to your hurts
you can look at your partner,
your child,
your friend
without the shadow of the past.

Then love flowers.

Love is the fragrance
of daily dying.

“What happens to the mind that dies every day?”

Questioner:

What is the state of such a mind?

Teacher:
It is an extraordinary mind—
alive,
sensitive,
undefended.

A mind that dies to the past
is free from conflict
because conflict requires continuity.

It is free from effort
because effort is the struggle
between what is
and what should be.

It is free from fear,
from burden,
from self-importance.

Such a mind is like a fresh spring—
ever renewing.

This renewal
is meditation.

“Does daily dying reveal the sacred?”

Questioner:
You often speak of something beyond thought,
beyond the known.
Is dying every day related to that?

Teacher:

A mind burdened with the past
cannot enter the timeless.

To encounter the sacred—
the immeasurable,
the vast,
the nameless—
the mind must be fresh.

Death—psychological death—
brings freshness.

When the self ends,
even for a moment,
there is a stillness beyond measure.

In that stillness,
the other,
the sacred,
is.

The Dialogue Enters Silence

Teacher spoke softly:

To die every day
is the highest form of intelligence.

It is the ending of time
as the past moving through the present into the future.

It is the ending of the self.

When you die every day,
you live completely.

You love completely.
You are free completely.

In such dying
there is immense beauty,
immense compassion,
immense truth.

The silence that followed
was not the silence of thought—
it was the silence of understanding.

*****

Me First, You Second

Sir, if we watch very quietly,
without judgement,
we will see that the whole structure of our society—
religious, economic, political, personal—
rests on one fundamental movement:

"Me first, you second."

This movement is so ancient,
so deeply rooted,
that we rarely question it.
It appears natural, inevitable—
as though it were the order of life itself.

But this movement,
this inward demand of the self,
is the origin of all conflict.

Let us look at it slowly.

The Self Is Always Putting Itself First

From childhood
we are conditioned to assert ourselves:

- "I must succeed."
- "I must be safe."
- "I must be superior."
- "I must get ahead."
- "I must protect my beliefs."
- "I must fulfil my desires."

The "me" becomes the centre of existence.

Everything is measured
in relation to this centre:

My job,
my family,
my religion,
my comfort,
my pleasure,
my fear.

And because everyone else
is doing exactly the same thing,
we live in a world of competing centres.

Each centre shouting silently:
"Me first."

From "Me First" Arises All Division

Where there is "me,"
there must be "you"—
separate, apart, other.

From this separation spring:

- jealousy,
- comparison,
- ambition,
- domination,
- violence,
- sorrow.

Look at nations—
each saying "my country first."
Look at religions—

each saying “my belief first.”
Look at families—
each member demanding recognition,
importance,
affection.

This “me first” principle
creates endless fragmentation.

The mind that lives in this structure
cannot know peace.

The Self Always Seeks Its Own Continuity

“Me first” is not merely an attitude.
It is the very survival mechanism
of the psychological self.

The self must continue—
and it continues through:

- memory,
- hurt,
- pleasure,
- belief,
- identification.

When the self says,
“Me first,”
it is protecting its own continuity.

And in protecting itself
it must deny, ignore, or suppress the other.

Thus, compassion becomes impossible
as long as the self demands priority.

“Me First” Operates Even in Goodness

Even when we try to be noble,
the self sneaks in subtly.

We say:

“I shall help others
—because it makes me feel good.”

“I must be spiritual
—because it gives me peace.”

“I must serve humanity
—because it gives me meaning.”

The self always finds a back door.

So long as the self is active,
even goodness becomes polluted
by self-centredness.

That is why Krishnamurti said:

“When the self is, love is not.”

Can the Self Put Itself Second?

One may ask:

“Should I put others before myself?”

But that still keeps the self in the centre:
I will be humble,

I will be generous,
I will be compassionate.

Virtue pursued by the self
is the shadow of ego.

Putting oneself second
is still a strategy of the self.

The question is not
whether the self is first or second.

The question is:
Can the self end?

Seeing the Movement of "Me First" Ends It

You cannot fight the self.
You cannot suppress it.
You cannot control it.

Every effort strengthens it.

Only awareness dissolves it.

When you observe the movement of "me"—
its fears,
its desires,
its insecurities,
its arrogance,
its sorrow—
without condemnation,
without justification,
without resistance—

the movement slows down,
becomes transparent.

And in this total observation
the “me” loses its grip.

It fades like mist under the morning sun.

When the “Me” Ends, Compassion Begins

When there is no “me first,”
there is no “you second.”

There is only relationship—
a natural sensitivity,
a natural affection,
a natural care.

Compassion is not cultivated.
Compassion arises
when the self is quiet.

Then action is not calculated—
not “helping others,”
not “serving society,”
not “doing good.”

It is simply action
born from clarity,
intelligence,
love.

True Revolution Is the Ending of “Me First”

All political revolutions fail

because they merely redistribute power
among different forms of “me first.”

All religious reforms fail
because the self continues
under new names,
new practices,
new beliefs.

True revolution
is the ending of the self.

It is psychological,
not ideological.

It begins with the simple,
profound observation:

“Why am I always first?”

If you look deeply,
without judgement,
you will see that the self
is nothing but memory,
thought,
conditioning.

And that which is old
can end.

So, what does “Me first, you second” point to?

It points to the root of all human conflict.
It points to the illusion of the self.
It points to the possibility of ending division.

It points to the beginning of compassion.

When the self ends,
even for a moment,
there is a sense of vastness—
a quietness that is not of time,
a peace that does not belong to any religion,
a love that has no opposite.

That is the ending of "me first."
That is the beginning of a different life.

***

A Dialogue

"Sir, why is it that in all our actions there seems to be a movement of 'me first'?"

Questioner:
I notice in daily life—
in relationships, work, even in kindness—
there is always a subtle whisper:
"Me first, you second."
Why does this happen?

Teacher:
Sir, let us observe not in theory
but in the mirror of our lives.

From childhood,
we are conditioned to think about ourselves:

"My success, my security, my pleasure, my achievement."
This becomes the centre of our existence.

This centre moves always toward its own continuation.

And anything that threatens this centre
is resisted.

So, the movement of "me first"
is not personal—
it is the very structure of the self.

"But isn't it natural to think of oneself first for survival?"

Questioner:
We are taught that self-interest is natural,
that survival demands it.
Isn't "me first" necessary?

Teacher:
Physical survival requires intelligence—
food, shelter, safety.

But psychological survival—
the survival of the image of oneself—
creates division.

The tiger kills to survive
but does not create psychological conflict.

Human beings carry images,
memories,
hurts,
ambitions.

It is this psychological entity
that demands priority.

And this priority
is the origin of conflict
in relationship and society.

“How exactly does ‘me first’ create conflict?”

Teacher:
When there is a centre—
the “me”—
there must be a circumference,
the “not me.”

Between these two
there is inevitable division.

From this division spring
jealousy, competition, domination, comparison.

Look at nations:
each says, “My country first.”

Look at religions:
“My belief first.”

Look at families:
“My child, my success, my sorrow.”

This constant assertion
of the self
is the root of fragmentation.

A mind that lives in fragmentation
cannot know peace.

“Is this self a real thing, or just thought?”

Questioner:
This “me” that puts itself first—
is it real?
Or is it something thought has created?

Teacher:
Let us inquire.

The “me” is built out of:

- memory,
- experience,
- hurt,
- pleasure,
- belief,
- ambition,
- comparison.

All of these are movements of thought.

Therefore, the “me”
is a structure put together by thought.

When thought gives continuity to this structure,
the “me” appears solid, permanent.

But in actuality,
the “me” is a bundle of memories.

Memory says:
“I must continue.”
“I must be important.”
“I must be safe.”

And so, arises
“Me first.”

“Can one make the self take second place?”

Questioner:
If “me first” is the problem,
can we train ourselves to be selfless,
to put others first?

Teacher:
If you try to put others first,
the “me” still remains.

It only disguises itself.

It says politely,
“I shall be humble,”
but the mover of humility
is still the “me.”

Effort to be unselfish
strengthens the self.

Do you see this?

True humility
is the absence of the self.

And such absence
cannot be practised.

“Then how does one end this ‘me first’ movement?”

Questioner:

If neither suppression nor discipline works,
what will end this constant self-assertion?

Teacher:
Only awareness.

When you watch the movement of the self—
how it seeks recognition,
how it wants to be right,
how it protects itself,
how it compares,
how it fears—
when you watch without condemnation
or approval—

this watching
brings the whole structure of the self
into light.

And what is seen clearly
has no strength to continue.

The seeing
is the ending.

“Is this ending painful?”

Questioner:
It sounds difficult,
even frightening.
Is the ending of the self painful?

Teacher:
Pain arises only when there is resistance.

You are not ending the self—
you are seeing it.

When you see a false thing as false,
there is no pain in ending it.

If you see clearly
that a snake is dangerous,
you do not resist the fact.
You drop it instantly.

Similarly,
when you see the falseness of "me first,"
it falls away naturally.

The truth of something
never creates suffering.

Only attachment to the false does.

"What happens to relationship when the 'me' is absent?"

Questioner:
If the "me" is gone,
what becomes of relationship?

Teacher:
Then for the first time
there is real relationship.

Not relationship based on need,
fear,
possession,
dependence,

image.

Where the “me” is,
relationship becomes a bargain.

But when the “me” subsides,
there is affection,
care,
sensitivity.

Love is not “me loving you.”

Love is the absence of the self.

“Does the ending of the self bring compassion?”

Questioner:
Is compassion a result of this ending?

Teacher:
When the self is not,
compassion is.

Compassion is not cultivated.
It is not practice,
not duty,
not morality.

It is the natural flowering
of a mind that is not preoccupied with itself.

Like a flower that blooms
when there is space,
compassion appears
when the self ends.

Compassion is intelligence in action.

“Is ending ‘me first’ the beginning of a different life?”

Questioner:
What kind of life opens
when the self ends?

Teacher:
A life of clarity,
of sensitivity,
of tremendous inward freedom.

When there is no “me first,”
there is no conflict within.

When there is no conflict within,
there is no conflict without.

Such a mind is simple—
not childish,
but innocent.

It sees beauty without seeking it.
It loves without motive.
It acts without fear.
It lives without comparison.

This freedom
is the very essence of the sacred.

The Dialogue Descends into Silence

Teacher’s voice softened:

When the self ends,
there is peace.
Not the peace of escape
or withdrawal,
but the peace of wholeness.

In the silence of that wholeness
lies compassion,
beauty,
and love.

To see the movement of “me first”
is to end it.

And to end it
is the beginning
of a life without conflict.

The silence remained—
a silence not of thought,
but of understanding.

*****

The End of Conflict — The Real Revolution

Sir, we have had revolutions of every kind—
political, religious, economic, technological.
One system replacing another,
one ideology overthrowing another,
one authority substituting a previous authority.

Each revolution promises freedom,
and each ends in conformity,
fear,
conflict,
violence,
new forms of oppression.

Why?

Because none of these revolutions
touch the root of human disorder.

They rearrange the outer structure
while the inner structure of the mind
remains unchanged.

As long as the human mind
is conditioned by fear,
by ambition,
by comparison,
by greed,
by belief,
by hurt,
by the pursuit of pleasure—

there can be no freedom.

The real revolution is the ending of conflict within oneself.

Conflict Exists Only When There Is Division

Observe yourself, sir.

There is conflict when:

- you want to be something
- and fear you may not be;
- you compare yourself with another;
- you cling to pleasure and resist pain;
- you pursue ideals against what you actually are;
- you hold an image of yourself
- and life contradicts that image.

Conflict is born from division:

the “what is”
versus
the “what should be.”

As long as there is an inner duality,
there must be struggle.

A divided mind can never be at peace.

Ideals Are the Continuation of Conflict

We think ideals—
nonviolence, goodness, discipline—
will end conflict.

But ideals are projections of desire,

images of what we think we ought to be.

The “ought” is always in the future.

Meanwhile, the “what is”—
anger, jealousy, fear, sorrow—
continues to operate.

The struggle between the fact
and the idealized image
creates conflict.

Ideals are escape routes
invented by thought.

Truth lies in seeing the fact, not escaping from it.

Understanding the Fact Ends Conflict

Sir, when you observe your anger
without justifying it,
without condemning it,
without suppressing it—

you begin to understand
its structure,
its origin,
its movement.

This understanding
is not intellectual.

It is direct perception.

In the light of such perception,

anger loses its vitality.

It ends naturally.

The seeing itself is the ending.

You do not “try” to end conflict.
All effort is a form of conflict.

You end conflict
by understanding the truth of conflict.

Truth has an extraordinary action—
a quiet ending.

The Real Revolution Is the Ending of the Psychological “Me”

All conflict springs
from the centre we call the “me”:

- my belief,
- my success,
- my fear,
- my wound,
- my image.

The “me” is a fragment
isolated from the whole of life.

Where there is isolation,
there must be conflict.

When the “me” is silent—
not suppressed,
not controlled,

but understood—

a totally different quality of mind operates.

This silence is vast,
unbroken,
indivisible.

This silence is the real revolution.

The End of Conflict Brings Intelligence

Intelligence is not cleverness,
not accumulated knowledge,
not strategic thinking.

Intelligence is the clarity
that sees conflict instantly
and ends it instantly.

Such intelligence
does not belong to any group,
nation,
religion,
or ideology.

It is the awakening of insight
in a mind that is attentive,
sensitive,
free.

This intelligence alone
creates order.

Where there is order,

there is no conflict.

The Real Revolution Is Immediate, Not Gradual

Human beings believe
they need time to change:

“Give me months, years,
a lifetime to transform myself.”

But time does not bring freedom.

Time only prolongs conflict.

Conflict ends
when you see it completely.

The very perception
of the nature of conflict
is instantaneous transformation.

Revolution is not in the future.

Revolution is now.

A Life Without Conflict Is a Life of Compassion

When conflict ends inside you,
there is no violence in your relationships.

Your mind is not burdened
by comparison, jealousy, fear.

You listen without resistance.
You act without self-centred motive.

You respond without the shadow of the past.

This sensitivity,
this tenderness,
is compassion.

Compassion is not a practice—
it is the perfume
of a mind without conflict.

The End of Conflict Is the Beginning of the Sacred

A mind caught in struggle
cannot know what is sacred.

When conflict ends—
truly ends—
the mind becomes extraordinarily quiet.

Not the quietness achieved by control,
but a quietness that comes
when the noise of the “me” has ended.

In that silence
there is a sense of vastness,
of immeasurable beauty.

This is not imagination.
It is the actual experience
of a mind that is whole.

Such wholeness is the real revolution.

Summary

- All outer revolutions fail because inner conflict continues.
- Conflict exists because of division within the mind.
- Ideals are escapes from "what is."
- Awareness of fact ends conflict instantly.
- The "me" is the creator of conflict.
- The ending of the "me" is the real revolution.
- In the absence of conflict, compassion, intelligence, and silence blossom.

***

A Dialogue

"Sir, what do you mean when you say the real revolution is the ending of conflict?"

Questioner:
We see revolutions across history—political, social, economic.
People overthrow systems hoping for freedom, justice, order.
But you say the real revolution is the ending of conflict within oneself.
Could you explain this?

Teacher:
Sir, all outer revolutions begin with hope
and end with new forms of authority,
new forms of fear,
new forms of oppression.

Why?

Because the human mind remains the same—

ambitious, envious, fearful, violent.

Changing the outer structure
without changing the inner structure
is like rearranging furniture
in a burning house.

So, the real revolution
is not out there.
It begins within.

It begins with the ending of conflict
in the human mind.

“But what exactly is conflict?”

Questioner:
When you speak of conflict,
what do you mean?
Is it the conflict we have with others,
or the struggle within ourselves?

Teacher:
Both, sir.

But the conflict with others
is merely an expression
of the conflict within.

Conflict exists when there is division.
The division between:

- what I am and what I think I should be,
- what I feel and what I want to feel,
- the ideal and the actual,
- desire and duty,

- fear and the search for security.

This inner contradiction
is the root of all psychological conflict.

“Isn’t conflict necessary for growth?”

Questioner:
People say struggle builds character,
that conflict helps us grow.
Isn’t conflict inevitable?

Teacher:
Sir, does conflict make a tree grow?
Does a child flourish under pressure?

Conflict wears down the mind.
A mind in conflict is confused,
exhausted,
fragmented.

Growth comes not from conflict,
but from clarity.

A mind that is clear
acts without contradiction.

That is intelligence.

“Why do we live in contradiction?”

Questioner:
What creates this inner division?
Why can’t we live in harmony with ourselves?

Teacher:
Thought creates the division.

Thought creates an image of what we should be:

"I must be successful."
"I must be calm."
"I must be spiritual."
"I must stop being angry."

So thought creates an ideal
and then struggles to reach it.

The conflict is between
the fact
and the image.

The fact is anger.
The image is non-anger.

The distance between the two
is conflict.

If you look closely,
you will see that all conflict
is born from comparison.

"So should we drop ideals?"

Questioner:
Are you saying ideals are harmful?

Teacher:
We are not condemning ideals.
We are observing.

Ideals project a future state—
and in pursuing that future,
we ignore the present.

If I am violent,
and I have an ideal of nonviolence,
I am escaping from the fact of violence.

The ideal strengthens conflict.

Understanding violence
requires direct observation,
not the pursuit of a principle.

Truth is in what is,

not in what should be.

“How does one end conflict?”

Questioner:
If conflict arises from division,
how do we end division?

Teacher:
By observing it.

Not by suppressing it,
not by escaping,
not by analysing endlessly.

Just observe.

Observe anger

without naming it.
Observe fear
without running away from it.
Observe jealousy
without condemning it.

In such observation
there is no division
between the observer and the observed.

Then the conflict ends naturally.

The seeing is the ending.

“Is this ending of conflict gradual or instantaneous?”

Questioner:
Does this take time?
Can one end conflict slowly?

Teacher:
Time does not end conflict.
Time only prolongs it.

You say,
“I will gradually become peaceful.”
In the meantime,
you continue to be violent.

Gradualness is the postponement of change.

Conflict ends
the moment you see it completely—
as you would drop a burning coal
the instant you realise it is burning your fingers.

Clarity is immediate.

“If conflict ends, what happens to ambition?”

Questioner:
Without conflict,
what happens to ambition,
to motivation?

Teacher:
Ambition is the pursuit of becoming—
becoming important,
becoming successful,
becoming spiritual.

This becoming
is a form of violence.

When conflict ends,
ambition loses its appeal.

Action continues—
but without comparison,
without struggle,
without psychological pressure.

You act out of intelligence,
not out of ambition.

And intelligence acts with tremendous energy.

“Does the ending of conflict lead to compassion?”

Questioner:

People talk of compassion and love.
Are these possible without ending conflict?

Teacher:
When there is conflict,
the mind is occupied with itself—
its fears,
its desires,
its hurts.

A mind that is self-centred
cannot love.

Love exists
only when the self is quiet.

When conflict ends,
there is space—
a vast inner space
in which tenderness,
kindness,
compassion
can flower.

Compassion is not an idea.
It is the fragrance
of a mind free of conflict.

"Is this freedom from conflict the sacred?"

Questioner:
You often speak of the sacred.
Is a mind free of conflict
related to that?

Teacher:
A mind that is caught in struggle
cannot touch the otherness of life,
the immensity,
the silence that is not manufactured.

Only when the noise of conflict ends
does the mind become still.

This stillness
is not cultivated
through discipline or effort.

It comes naturally
when the self is not active.

In that stillness,
there is a sense of vastness,
a beauty beyond measure.

This is the beginning
of the sacred.

The Dialogue Settles into Quietness

Teacher spoke softly:

The real revolution
is not in the streets,
not in the parliaments,
not in the changing of governments.

The real revolution
is the ending of conflict in the human mind.

When conflict ends,
there is clarity.
From clarity, compassion.
From compassion, action.
From action, a new world.

This is the revolution
that does not depend on time,
on ideology,
or on authority.

It begins with you
seeing the truth of yourself.

It begins now.

Silence deepened—
not as an effort,
but as a natural flowering
of understanding.

*****

Freedom from Fear — The Real Revolution

Sir, we have accepted fear as an inevitable companion of life—
fear of losing,
fear of failing,
fear of not becoming,
fear of loneliness,
fear of old age,
fear of death,
fear of love,
fear of freedom.

It hides in the deep recesses of the mind,
shaping every thought,
every decision,
every relationship.

We may change governments, reform religions,
invent new technologies, create new economic systems—
yet as long as fear remains,
there can be no real revolution.

Freedom from fear is the real revolution.

Fear Is the Root of Disorder

If we observe quietly,
not as Indians, Americans, Hindus, Muslims,
but as human beings,
we see that fear is the source of all inward disorder.

Fear breeds:

- aggression,
- conformity,
- obedience,
- superstition,
- imitation,
- dependence,
- escape,
- cruelty.

A frightened mind
can never be free.
It can only submit, resist, or escape.

So long as fear remains,
the mind is incapable of clarity or love.

Fear Is Born of Thought and Time

Fear is always of something:

- something that may happen,
- something that might return,
- something remembered,
- something imagined.

Fear is born from thought projecting itself into the future.

Thought says:

“I may fail.”
“I may lose.”
“I may suffer again.”
“I may be alone.”

This projection becomes fear.

Fear is the shadow cast by time.

Where thought and time operate psychologically,
fear is inevitable.

Fear Persists Because We Want Safety

We crave psychological security:

- in beliefs,
- in relationships,
- in possessions,
- in identity,
- in experience.

But psychological security does not exist.

There is no permanent relationship,
no permanent belief,
no permanent achievement,
no permanent identity.

The desire for psychological safety
creates fear.

Fear is the by-product
of clinging to what cannot be held.

Escapes Only Strengthen Fear

Look at what we do when we are afraid:

- we escape into entertainment,
- we escape into religion,
- we escape into meditation systems,
- we escape into work,
- we escape into wealth or power,

- we escape into illusions.

Every escape makes fear stronger
because the root is never touched.

To be free of fear
one must stop running away from it.

Facing Fear Is Freedom

To be free of fear
you must come directly into contact with it.

Not through words,
not through analysis,
not through suppression.

But direct contact.

Like touching a flame
without flinching.

When you look fear in the face
without naming it,
without judging it,
without trying to get rid of it—

there is no division
between the observer
and the observed.

In that moment,
fear reveals its structure:

It is thought.

It is memory.
It is anticipation.

The clear seeing
is the ending.

Fear cannot continue
when it is seen completely.

Freedom from Fear Is Not Courage

Courage fights fear.
And what you fight,
you strengthen.

Bravery is still fear
wearing a mask of resistance.

Freedom from fear
is not the result of resistance,
discipline,
or willpower.

It is the ending of fear
through understanding.

Understanding comes
from silent observation.

The Ending of Fear Is the Beginning of Intelligence

When fear ends,
the mind becomes astonishingly sensitive—
alive, awake, profoundly intelligent.

This intelligence is not cleverness.
It is not knowledge.

It is clarity free from distortion.

Fear darkens the mind.
Freedom illuminates it.

Such a mind
knows what to do
without effort,
without confusion,
without contradiction.

A Mind Without Fear Knows Love

Fear and love cannot coexist.

Where fear is,
there is attachment, dependence, jealousy.

Fear says:

“I need you.”
“Don’t leave me.”
“You are mine.”

Such a mind cannot love.
It can only possess.

But when fear ends,
love begins.

Love is the absence of fear.
Love is the freedom to see

without distortion.

Love is the real compassion—
not sentiment,
not duty,
but the natural fragrance
of a mind unburdened by fear.

Freedom from Fear Opens the Door to the Sacred

A mind burdened with fear
is noisy, fragmented, inwardly violent.

Such a mind cannot possibly
touch the sacred.

Only a mind that is utterly free—
free from fear,
free from effort,
free from becoming—
can enter that dimension
of vast stillness,
great beauty,
and immeasurable quiet.

That stillness
is the essence of the sacred.

So, what is the real revolution?

It is not the overthrow of governments.

It is not the replacement of one leader with another.

It is not the adoption of new ideologies.

The real revolution
is the ending of fear
in the human heart.

When fear ends—

- relationship is transformed,
- society is transformed,
- thought becomes clear,
- love becomes possible,
- the mind becomes whole,
- a new way of living begins.

Freedom from fear is the foundation of true liberation.

It is the real revolution.

***

A Dialogue

"Sir, why do you say freedom from fear is the real revolution?"

Questioner:
All over the world people talk of political revolution,
economic change, social reforms.
But you say the real revolution
is freedom from fear.
Why do you give fear such importance?

Teacher:
Because, madam,
fear is the root of all human disorder.

Outwardly we may change systems,

leaders, laws.
But inwardly,
if fear continues—

fear of losing,
fear of failing,
fear of being hurt,
fear of not becoming somebody—

then whatever we build outwardly
will inevitably create new forms of insecurity.

So, the real revolution
begins in the human heart—
with the ending of fear.

“Is fear always present in us?”

Questioner:
I feel fear in many areas of life—
fear of loneliness, fear of death, fear of rejection.
Is fear universal?

Teacher:
Fear is common to all humanity.

You are afraid,
the person sitting next to you is afraid,
human beings in every country
are afraid.

Fear is a single thread
woven through the consciousness of mankind.

It may take different forms

depending on culture, conditioning, experience—
but the essence is the same.

Recognizing this
brings great humility.

You are not alone in fear.
Fear is the sorrow of humanity.

“Where does fear come from?”

Questioner:
Why does fear arise at all?
What is its root?

Teacher:
Let us inquire together.

Fear is always about something
that might happen—

“I may lose my job.”
“I may be hurt again.”
“I may not succeed.”
“I may be abandoned.”

So, fear is a projection of thought.

Thought remembers the past
and imagines the future.

Fear lives in the shadow
of what might be.

Therefore, fear is the movement of thought

in time.

Without psychological time—
tomorrow, later, the future—
fear cannot exist.

“Can thought stop fear?”

Questioner:
If thought creates fear,
can thought also end fear?

Teacher:
Thought is both the creator
and the sustainer of fear.

So, thought cannot end fear.

Thought may offer temporary comfort—
reassurance, belief, rationalization—
but these are bandages, not healing.

Thought invents beliefs
to protect itself:

“God will take care of me.”
“I will pray.”
“I will follow a guru.”

These may soothe temporarily,
but fear remains underneath.

Only the ending of thought in its psychological aspect
can dissolve fear.

“How do we look at fear?”

Questioner:
When fear arises,
we instinctively want to escape from it.
How can we look at fear directly?

Teacher:
Sir, you must come into direct contact with fear.

Not through words,
not through analysis,
not through resistance.

When fear arises:

- do not name it,
- do not run away,
- do not suppress it,
- do not rationalize it.

Just watch the sensation.

Observe what happens in your body—
the tightening,
the quickening of breath,
the contraction.

Look at it as you would
a child trembling.

If you watch without escaping,
fear unfolds itself.

Fear reveals its own story
without your interference.

In this watching
there is no division
between the observer
and the observed.

Where there is no division,
fear loses its power.

“Is fear ever helpful?”

Questioner:
Some people say fear protects us,
keeps us cautious.
Is fear necessary for survival?

Teacher:
Physical fear—
the instinctive response to danger—
is necessary.
That is intelligence.

But psychological fear—
the fear born of thought—
is destructive.

Psychological fear paralyses the mind.
It prevents clear thinking.
It makes us cruel,
possessive,
dependent.

Survival requires alertness,
not fear.

Fear distorts perception;
alertness sharpens it.

“How does fear affect our relationships?”

Questioner:
Does fear shape the way we relate to others?

Teacher:
Completely, madam.

Where fear exists,
there is possessiveness:

“I am afraid of losing you.”
“I am afraid of loneliness.”
“I am afraid of rejection.”

Such fear becomes attachment,
and attachment breeds jealousy,
dependence,
control.

Where fear is,
love cannot be.

Fear pollutes relationship
because it puts the self first—
my comfort,
my security,
my need.

Love blossoms only
in a mind free of fear.

“Can one be free of fear completely?”

Questioner:
Is it actually possible
to be totally free of fear?

Teacher:
Not eventually.
Not gradually.
Not as a distant ideal.

Fear ends
only when it is seen clearly
in the moment of its arising.

Time does not end fear.
Time sustains fear.

When the mind sees fear
without naming,
without running away,
without resistance—

that very seeing
is the ending.

In freedom from fear
there is immense energy,
immense clarity.

“Is freedom from fear the beginning of intelligence?”

Questioner:
You often say that intelligence comes
when fear ends.

What is the relationship?

Teacher:
Fear clouds the mind.

A frightened mind
cannot perceive truth,
cannot love,
cannot act clearly.

When fear ends,
the mind is free to look,
free to learn,
free to act without distortion.

This freedom
is intelligence.

Intelligence is not cleverness—
not accumulated knowledge.

Intelligence is the clarity
that comes when fear is absent.

“Is this freedom related to the sacred?”

Questioner:
You speak of a dimension beyond thought,
beyond fear.
Is freedom from fear
connected to the sacred?

Teacher:
When fear ends,
the mind becomes still.

Not the stillness created by discipline,
but a stillness born of understanding.

In that stillness
a different quality of awareness emerges—
vast, unbounded,
untouched by the self.

In that silence
there is a sense of profundity,
a presence that is not measurable.

This silent, vast presence
is the sacred.

Without freedom from fear
the sacred cannot be touched.

The Dialogue Settles into Silence

Teacher spoke softly:

Freedom from fear
is not a small thing.
It is the real revolution.

When fear ends,
the self loses its dominance.
When the self ends,
love begins.
When love begins,
a new world begins.

This revolution

does not require time,
belief,
or authority.

It requires only
attention—
a deep, choiceless awareness
of fear as it arises.

Taste freedom once,
and fear will never again
have the same power.

The hall remained still,
filled with a silence
that was its own teaching.

*****

The fear of Survival

Man is afraid of tomorrow not merely because of physical survival, but because psychologically he has projected himself into the future. Tomorrow represents uncertainty—the possible loss of identity, position, security, image, continuity. So, fear is born, not from the fact of living, but from the idea of living in time.

For the body, practical planning is necessary. Food, shelter, health, and safety require intelligence and foresight. But psychologically, man uses tomorrow as a refuge and a threat. He hopes tomorrow will Fulfill him, or he fears tomorrow will destroy what he is today. In both cases, the mind is escaping the present.

Fear of survival is sustained by thought. Thought carries the past—experience, memory, conditioning—and projects it forward as tomorrow. This projection becomes a psychological future. The mind then clings to continuity: "I must survive as I am." From this clinging arise anxiety, competition, greed, accumulation, and violence.

When one observes fear without trying to escape from it, one sees that fear exists only when thought moves away from what is. In the present moment, there is no fear—only the fact of living. Fear appears when the mind leaves the now and enters the imagined future.

To understand fear is not to suppress it or overcome it, but to see its structure. Fear is time. Fear is thought. Fear is the demand for continuity.

When there is no psychological tomorrow, fear ends. This does not mean carelessness or irresponsibility. It means that the mind does what is necessary now, without projecting itself into becoming something later.

So, the question is not how to be free from fear of survival, but whether the mind can see the truth that psychologically, there is nothing to survive. What ends is the image, the self, the accumulation of the past. What remains is life itself, moving freely, without fear of tomorrow.

***

Questioner:
Man is afraid of tomorrow. Why is there this fear of survival?

Speaker:
What do you mean by survival? Is it only the survival of the body, or something psychological?

Questioner:
It seems psychological. Fear of losing security, position, identity.

Speaker:
Yes. Physically, planning is necessary. But psychologically, thought projects itself into tomorrow and demands continuity.

Questioner:
So, fear is related to time?

Speaker:
Fear exists when thought moves from what is now into an imagined future. Thought takes the past and projects it forward as tomorrow.

Questioner:
But tomorrow is uncertain. Is fear not natural?

Speaker:
Uncertainty is natural. Fear arises when the mind wants certainty and continuity. It wants to survive as the same self.

Questioner:
So, it is the self that wants to survive?

Speaker:
Exactly. The body may need care, but fear is about the image, the name, the experience saying, I must continue.

Questioner:
And this demand creates fear?

Speaker:
Yes. Fear is time. Fear is thought. Fear is the desire for continuity.

Questioner:
Is it possible to live without psychological tomorrow?

Speaker:
Yes, when the mind sees the falseness of psychological time. Then it acts in the present without fear.

Questioner:
What happens to fear then?

Speaker:
Fear ends. Because in the present moment there is only living, not survival.

Questioner:
So psychologically there is nothing to survive?

Speaker:
What ends is the self, the image. Life itself does not seek continuity.

Questioner:
So, freedom from fear comes through seeing?

Speaker:
Yes. Seeing now, not becoming free tomorrow.

*****

Learning Is to Act

Sir, we have separated learning from action—
as though one belongs to the intellect
and the other to daily life.
We learn first,
and then try to act according to what we have learned.

This division
is the root of confusion.

In true learning there is immediate action.

In true action there is continuous learning.

Let us look at this carefully.

Learning Is Not Accumulation

What we commonly call learning
is the gathering of information,
the cultivation of memory,
the storing of knowledge.

This learning belongs to thought,
and thought is always old.

It is never fresh,
never alive,
never in direct relationship with the moment.

When action comes from knowledge,
action is always delayed,
fragmented,

mechanical.

Knowledge acts;

but knowledge is the past.
Therefore, action from knowledge
is never whole.

Learning Is Observation in the Present

True learning
is the act of observing
without the interference of the past.

It is to see:

the fact,
the feeling,
the reaction,

as it is
in the very moment it arises.

This direct perception
is learning.

Such learning has no tomorrow.
It has no motive.
It does not try to become something.

It simply sees.

And the seeing is the action.

When You See Anger Completely, the Seeing Is the Ending

If you learn about anger
through analysis or explanation,
you will act later—
in time.

This delay creates conflict.

But when you observe anger
as it arises—

without condemning it,
without justifying it,
without running from it—

you learn its entire structure
in a single moment.

And in that very moment,
anger ends.

The learning and the ending

are one movement.

This is action.

Learning Is Not Trying to Change—It Is Seeing What Is

Any attempt to change
what you observe
is not learning.

It is desire.

Learning implies
a mind that is free to see,
not a mind that wants to become.

When the mind is quiet,
free of resistance,
free of evaluation,
free of conclusions—

it learns instantly.

And from that learning
action flows naturally,
without effort.

The Mind That Learns Is Always Fresh

A mind burdened with knowledge
reacts.

A mind that is learning
responds.

Reaction comes from memory;
response comes from intelligence.

Learning keeps the mind young,
fluid,
innocent.

Such a mind acts
without the distortions of fear,
without the weight of tradition,

without the pressure of authority.

A learning mind is a free mind.

A free mind acts rightly.

Learning and Action Are Not Two Separate Movements

We think:

"I will learn discipline
and then act with discipline."

"I will learn compassion
and then act compassionately."

But to learn compassion
is to be compassionate now.

To learn order
is to act without disorder now.

To learn clarity
is to see clearly now.

Learning is not preparation for action.
Learning is action.

And action deepens learning.

The two are inseparable.

In Relationship, Learning Is Immediate Action

Relationship is the ground

of self-revelation.

In relationship,
anger appears,
jealousy appears,
hurt appears.

If you observe these movements
without resistance,
you learn about yourself instantly.

And that very learning
transforms the relationship.

Transformation does not come
later,
through memory,
through practice.

It comes now—
through the flame of attention.

Attention is learning.

Attention is action.

When Learning and Action Are One, There Is No Regret, No Conflict

Regret exists
only when action is based on the past
and contradicts the present.

Conflict exists
only when learning is postponed.

When learning and action
are a single movement,
there is no fear of tomorrow,
no burden of yesterday.

The mind lives in the present—
completely, intensely.

This intensity is intelligence.

Learning Is the Essence of Living

Living is learning.
Learning is living.

But we have made living mechanical—
a repetition of patterns,
habits,
beliefs,
memories.

True living
is the continuous discovery
of what you are from moment to moment.

This discovery
is always new,
always unfolding.

To learn is to be alive.

To act is to express this aliveness.

When learning and action

move together like a single wave,
life becomes harmonious,
simple,
creative.

This is the timeless movement
of a mind that is awake.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, what does it mean when you say learning is to act?”

Questioner:
We usually learn first,
and then decide how to act.
School teaches us,
experience teaches us,
and later we apply what we learned.
But you say learning itself is action.
Could you explain?

Teacher:
Sir, what we ordinarily call learning
is the accumulation of knowledge.
Knowledge belongs to the past.
It is memory.

When action is based on memory,
action is always old.

It is never fresh.
It never truly meets the challenge of the moment.

But learning in the sense I am speaking of

is not accumulation.

It is direct perception.

When you see something clearly—
in that very seeing
there is action.

The seeing and the action
are not two different movements.

They are one.

“Do you mean knowledge is not necessary?”

Questioner:
Are you saying knowledge is not needed?
We depend on knowledge for everything—
medicine, science, daily work.

Teacher:
Of course, sir.
Knowledge is necessary
in the field of technology,
in practical matters.

But knowledge is never sufficient
in the field of relationship,
in understanding oneself,
in meeting life inwardly.

Knowledge cannot teach you
how to love,
how to be free of fear,
how to end sorrow.

These require direct perception,
not accumulated memory.

It is in this inner field
that learning and action are one.

“How does direct perception act immediately?”

Questioner:
This immediate action—
what does it look like?

Teacher:
Sir, let us take a simple example.

If you see a snake on your path,
your response is instantaneous.
You do not think,
“Is this the right action?
Should I consult my memory?”

The perception itself
is the action.

Similarly,
if you see the truth of something psychologically—
the truth of anger,
the truth of jealousy,
the truth of fear—

the very seeing
transforms the mind.

There is no separation

between learning and doing.

“But we do react from memory, especially with anger.”

Questioner:
Often when I am angry,
I react instantly too—
but that reaction comes from memory,
from past hurt.

How is that different
from perception?

Teacher:
Reaction is mechanical.
It arises from conditioning.

When you say
“I am angry,”
it is the old anger repeating itself.

There is no learning there.

Learning occurs
when you observe anger
as it arises—
without naming it,
without justifying it,
without escaping.

Then anger reveals its structure:
its cause,
its movement,
its illusion.

This observation
is learning.

And that very observation
ends anger.

This ending
is action.

“So learning is observing without the past?”

Questioner:
Is this the essence?
Observing without the past?

Teacher:
Yes, sir.

The past—
your education,
your beliefs,
your hurts,
your successes—
interferes with perception.

When the past interferes,
there is no direct seeing.

You see only through the filter
of what has been.

Learning occurs
when you see without the filter.

Such seeing is fresh,

innocent,
alive.

And from that freshness
comes right action.

“Is this learning possible in relationship?”

Questioner:
Most of our conflict happens in relationships.
Can this kind of learning operate there?

Teacher:
It must.

Relationship is the mirror
in which you see yourself clearly.

If your partner hurts you,
the old memories rush forward:

“You always do this.”
“You don’t care.”
“You never listen.”

This is the past speaking.

But if you observe the hurt
in the moment it arises—
without naming,
without letting memory speak—

you learn about yourself instantly.

This learning alters the relationship

without effort.

To observe without the past
is to act without conflict.

“Why do we separate learning and action?”

Questioner:
Why have we created this division
between learning first
and acting later?

Teacher:
Because we rely on authority, sir.

We say:

“Tell me what to do
and I will follow.”

So, we accumulate ideas,
principles,
methods,
teachings.

Then we try to fit action
into these frameworks.

This division
creates contradiction
and therefore conflict.

A mind that depends on authority
never learns.

It only imitates.

Learning begins
when imitation ends.

“Does learning require effort?”

Questioner:
This seems difficult.
Doesn’t it require great effort
to observe so clearly?

Teacher:
Effort exists only
when there is contradiction.

When you want to be attentive
but the mind wanders,
you make an effort.

But attention is not effort.
Attention comes
when the mind sees the importance
of learning in the very moment of living.

When there is choiceless awareness,
learning and action
flow naturally.

Effort belongs to discipline.
Learning belongs to freedom.

“What is the quality of a mind that learns in this way?”

Questioner:

If one lives with this kind of learning,
what does the mind become?

Teacher:
It becomes extraordinarily sensitive—
awake,
alert,
free.

A mind that is constantly learning
is never burdened with accumulation.

It is like a fresh stream,
not a stagnant pool.

Each moment reveals something new—
about oneself,
about others,
about life.

Such a mind acts rightly
because its action
is born from clarity,
not from habit or fear.

This intelligence in action
is the essence of real learning.

“Is this the foundation of transformation?”

Questioner:
Is this instant learning
the key to inner transformation?

Teacher:

Yes, sir.

Transformation is not gradual.
It is not achieved through practice,
discipline,
or methods.

Transformation happens
when the mind sees the truth
of its own movement.

When you see the falseness
of comparison,
you stop comparing.

When you see the truth
that fear is created by thought,
fear begins to end.

The seeing
is the transformation.

This is learning.
This is action.

There is no interval
between the two.

The Dialogue Falls into Silence

Teacher spoke softly:

Learning is not preparation for life.
Learning is life.

When you look at yourself,
at your fears,
at your desires,
at your ambitions,
at your relationships—
with complete attention—
the learning of each moment
acts instantly.

And that instant action
brings order.

Order is not imposed.
It blossoms naturally
from understanding.

In this way of living,
there is no stagnation,
no routine,
no repetition.

There is a freshness,
a simplicity,
a beauty.

A mind that learns
is a mind that lives.

The hall remained still—
as though touched
by a quiet revelation.

*****

Observing Ourselves

Sir, the most fundamental inquiry of life
is not into the stars,
nor into scriptures,
nor into the structure of society,
but into ourselves.

Because we are the source of disorder.
We are the makers of conflict.
We are the creators of division.
And unless we understand ourselves,
nothing we touch
will ever be free of confusion.

Self-observation is the beginning of wisdom.

But observing ourselves
is not what we think it is.

Let us explore this slowly, carefully.

Observing Is Not Judging

When we look at ourselves
we immediately judge:

“I should not be angry.”
“I must be more spiritual.”
“I must not feel jealous.”
“This is good, that is bad.”

This judging fragmentizes the mind.

Judgement is interference.
It prevents perception.

To observe oneself
means to look without condemnation,
without justification,
without comparison.

To simply see
“What is.”

Observing Is Not Analyzing

Analysis is the movement of thought.
Thought divides:

the analyzer
and the thing being analysed.

But the analyzer
is the analysed—
they are the same movement.

When fear appears
and thought says,
“I must understand this fear,”
it is fear trying to understand itself.

Analysis can go on endlessly
without ending the problem.

Observation ends instantly
what analysis prolongs indefinitely.

Seeing the fact is more important

than explaining the fact.

Observation Means Attention Without Choice

We usually pay attention
to what pleases us
or frightens us.

This selective attention
is not observation.

Observation requires
choiceless awareness.

To watch:

your thoughts,
your motives,
your reactions,
your desires,
your fears—

without choosing
which to keep
and which to avoid.

This choiceless attention
has immense beauty.

It is the perfume
of a mind that is free.

To Observe Ourselves Is to Observe in Daily Life

Self-observation does not happen
in isolation,
in meditation rooms,
or intellectual discussions.

It happens:

when you are irritated,
when you are comparing,
when you feel lonely,
when you seek approval,
when you are jealous,
when you are ambitious.

Each reaction
reveals the whole structure
of the self.

Daily life
is the real scripture
in which truth is written.

Observation Is Not Control

Control implies conflict:

one part of the mind
trying to dominate another.

This inner division
is the essence of disorder.

Observation has no controller.
It has no centre dictating:

“This should be suppressed.”
“This should be cultivated.”

Observation means
the total awareness
of the entire movement
of thought and emotion.

In such awareness
there is no conflict.

And where there is no conflict
there is great clarity.

In Observing Ourselves, the Observer Disappears

When you watch a thought closely—
its birth, its movement, its fading—
you see something extraordinary:

the observer
is also a thought.

The “I” that says,
“I am observing my thought,”
is itself another thought
pretending to be separate.

When this is seen clearly,
the observer dissolves.

Then there is only observation—
pure, unmediated.

This is a great moment

because the ending of the observer
is the ending of conflict.

Observation Brings Immediate Transformation

When you perceive something completely,
the perception itself
is action.

If you see the truth
that comparison creates envy,
you stop comparing.

If you see the truth
that fear is created by thought,
fear begins to end.

If you see the truth
that psychological becoming
is the root of suffering,
you stop becoming.

There is no effort,
no decision,
no discipline.

The seeing
is the transformation.

Observation Is the Beginning of Silence

A mind that observes
does not chatter.

It listens quietly

to the whole movement of life.

This silence
is not cultivated—
it is not an achievement.

It arises spontaneously
when the mind is attentive
to its own movement.

In this silence
there is immense space,
immense clarity,
immense beauty.

Such silence
is the doorway to the sacred.

So, what is “Observing Ourselves”?

It is:

- seeing without judgement,
- watching without resistance,
- listening without interference,
- being aware without choice,
- understanding without analysis,
- perceiving without a centre.

It is the observation
of the movement of the self.

And in that very observation
the self begins to dissolve.

This dissolution

is the birth of intelligence,
of compassion,
of a life without conflict.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, what does it really mean to observe ourselves?”

Questioner:
You say often that self-knowledge is the beginning of freedom,
and that we must observe ourselves.
But what does this observation actually mean?
Is it thinking about ourselves,
reflecting, analysing?

Teacher:
No, sir.
Thinking about yourself is still thought.
Thought cannot observe.
Thought divides the observer from the observed.

To observe oneself
means to watch the movement of one’s own mind
as it is happening—
without judgement,
without comparison,
without distortion.

Observation is pure seeing.

“But when I observe myself, I immediately judge what I see.”

Questioner:
When I look at myself,
I instantly say,
"This is good,"
"This is bad,"
"I should not have done that,"
"I must be better."

Judgement is automatic.
How can one observe without judging?

Teacher:
Sir, judgement is a habit of centuries.
It is our conditioning.

Judgement strengthens the self.
It says,
"I know what is right.
I know what I should be."

But the "should be"
is an invention of thought.

The fact
is what you are at this moment.

If you judge the fact,
you cannot see it.

So, the first thing is to recognize
that judgement prevents observation.

If you see that clearly—
not intellectually,
but actually—

the very seeing ends judgement.

Then observation becomes simple.

“Is observation the same as analysis?”

Questioner:
Psychologists tell us to analyse our thoughts,
to trace our emotions back to childhood,
to understand our motives.
Isn’t that also observation?

Teacher:
Analysis implies an analyser
separate from the thing analysed.

But the analyser
is the analysed.

Your fear says,
“I must analyse fear.”
Your jealousy says,
“I must get rid of jealousy.”

This division
is illusion.

Further, analysis takes time.
And during that time
fear continues.

Observation is immediate.

In observation
there is no analyser,

no division—
only the fact.

And the fact has its own action.

“What is choiceless awareness?”

Questioner:
You use the phrase
“Choiceless awareness.”
Is this awareness essential to observing ourselves?

Teacher:
Yes, sir.

Choice exists
only when there is confusion.

When you see clearly,
there is no need to choose—
you just act.

Choiceless awareness means
watching the movement of your thoughts,
your feelings,
your reactions,
without choosing which to keep
and which to discard.

When the mind watches itself
without choice,
there is extraordinary clarity.

And clarity is intelligence.

“Can this observation happen in daily life?”

Questioner:
It seems possible to observe quietly
when sitting alone,
but in daily life—
when someone hurts me,
when I get angry—
I lose awareness.

How can observation happen then?

Teacher:
Daily life
is the only place
where observation can take place.

When you are hurt—
in that very moment,
before the mind rushes to defend,
to retaliate,
to justify—
watch the feeling.

Watch how the body tightens,
how thought rushes in to protect the image.

This watching
is the beginning of freedom.

You cannot practise awareness
separately from life.

Life is the mirror
in which you observe yourself.

“Isn’t observing myself selfish?”

Questioner:
If I am always watching myself,
doesn’t that become self-centred?
A kind of self-preoccupation?

Teacher:
Sir, self-observation
is not self-centredness.

Self-centredness
is the movement of thought
building images—
“I am important,”
“I must succeed,”
“I am hurt,”
“I am spiritual.”

But observing the movement of the self
is the ending of self-centredness.

To see the self clearly
is to understand its illusory nature.

When the self grows quiet,
there is naturally compassion,
naturally intelligence,
naturally love.

Self-observation
is the beginning of the ending
of the self.

“Why does the observer disappear?”

Questioner:
You say that in true observation
the observer disappears.
What does that mean?

Teacher:
Let us look together.

When you watch a thought closely—
its birth,
its movement,
its fading—
you realize something astonishing:

The observer who says
“I am watching”
is also a thought.

The observer
is not separate
from the observed.

This is not a theory.
You can see it directly.

When you see this truth
with clarity,
the observer quietens.

And then there is only observation—
pure, uncorrupted,
free.

In such observation
there is no conflict.

“Does observation bring change?”

Questioner:
Can mere observation
actually, transform our lives?
Doesn’t change require effort?

Teacher:
Effort implies conflict—
the conflict between
what I am
and what I think I should be.

Observation has no conflict.

When you see a snake clearly,
you do not make an effort to avoid it—
the seeing is the action.

When you see the truth
of fear,
of anger,
of jealousy—
their falseness ends.

Transformation is not gradual.
It is not a result of practice.

Transformation happens
in the moment of complete observation.

The seeing is the doing.

“What is the quality of a mind that observes?”

Questioner:
If one lives this way—
watching oneself without judgement—
what kind of mind does one have?

Teacher:
A mind that observes
is a mind that is sensitive,
alive,
awake.

It is not burdened by conclusions.
It is not caught in habit.
It is not damaged by comparison.

Such a mind
is young at any age.

It meets life freshly—
each moment a new beginning.

This freshness
is the essence of intelligence.

The Dialogue Settles into Silence

Teacher spoke softly:

To observe oneself
is the beginning and the ending
of all learning.

The world is in confusion
because each of us
refuses to look at ourselves.

If you observe yourself
without judgement,
without fear,
without escape—

you will find
that the mind becomes astonishingly still.

And in that stillness
there is the flowering of insight.

Insight is complete action.

Insight is intelligence.

Insight is freedom.

The room remained still—
as though the silence itself
were teaching.

*****

The Tremendous Danger of Psychological Registration

Sir, the human mind is constantly registering—
not only the facts necessary for daily living,
but also, the wounds, the pleasures,
the insults, the flattery,
the successes and failures
that shape the "me."

This psychological registration
is the beginning of disorder.

It is the source of conflict,
fear,
hurt,
violence,
and endless sorrow.

To understand its danger
is to understand oneself.

What Is Psychological Registration?

Registration, by itself,
is not the problem.

The brain must register
certain things for survival:

- the path to your home,
- your language,
- how to drive a car,
- how to perform surgery.

This is factual registration.

But psychological registration
occurs when the mind stores:

- an insult,
- a compliment,
- a hurtful word,
- a moment of pleasure,
- an image of oneself,
- a memory of being admired,
- a memory of being rejected.

These do not remain as facts.
They become part of the self.

The "me" is built out of psychological registrations.

Where there is a "me,"
there must be conflict.

Registration Creates the Image, and the Image Creates Conflict

The mind registers a hurt—
someone spoke harshly,
someone betrayed you,
someone dismissed you.

This hurt creates an image of yourself:

"I am wounded."
"I must protect myself."
"I must not be hurt again."

From that image

spring fear, distance, resistance.

Similarly, pleasure creates
its own image:

“I must repeat this feeling.”
“I want more.”
“I cannot bear to lose this.”

When pleasure is denied,
fear and anger arise.

Every psychological registration

strengthens the image you have of yourself,
and the image is always in conflict with life.

Registration Destroys Relationship

In relationship,
the mind is constantly registering.

Your partner says something—
you interpret it,
you store it,
you carry it into tomorrow.

A hurt from yesterday
stands between you and the person today.

A compliment forms an expectation;
a criticism forms a wound.

Soon you are not relating
to the human being beside you

but to a bundle of memories.

Where there is psychological registration,
relationship dies.

We do not meet each other;

we meet our images of each other.

This is the root of separation.

Registration Prevents Learning

When you register an experience
as “good” or “bad,”
“pleasant” or “unpleasant,”
you approach the next moment
with prejudice.

You no longer see freshly.

Registration conditions perception.

A mind burdened with registration
is incapable of learning.

Learning requires innocence—
a mind that is not carrying
the weight of yesterday.

Registration Strengthens Fear and Anxiety

Fear is the continuation
of psychological registration.

You were hurt yesterday,
so, you fear being hurt tomorrow.

You experienced pleasure yesterday,
so, you fear losing it tomorrow.

Fear is the projection
of registered memory.

Where there is psychological registration,
fear is inevitable.

Registration Prevents the Ending of Sorrow

Sorrow is a wound
that has been registered
and held.

The event may have passed—
death of a loved one,
betrayal,
failure—
but the memory of sorrow,
the registration of sorrow,
continues to live inside the mind.

This continuation
is psychological time.

And psychological time
sustains sorrow.

To end sorrow,
one must understand
the movement of registration.

Why Is Psychological Registration Dangerous?

Because it creates
the centre—
the "I,"
the "me,"
the ego.

This centre divides:

- you and me,
- ours and theirs,
- believer and non-believer,
- my country and your country,
- my God and your God.

From this division
arise conflict,
violence,
war.

Psychological registration
is the foundation
of human suffering.

It is the seed of the self,

and the self is the root of all conflict.

Is It Possible to Live Without Registering Psychologically?

Yes.

When there is complete attention

in the moment of experience,
the mind does not register psychologically.

Attention is a flame
that burns away the residue.

In attention:

- an insult ends as it is spoken,
- a compliment has no continuation,
- a hurt does not become memory,
- pleasure does not become a chain.

Attention sees the fact
without storing it.

Where there is total observation,
there is no psychological registration.

This does not mean
you become insensitive.

On the contrary—
you become extraordinarily sensitive
because you are not carrying
the burden of the past.

A Mind Free of Registration Is a Mind Free of the "Me"

When registration stops,
the centre that says:

"I am hurt,"
"I am important,"
"I must succeed,"
"I have been insulted,"

“I am superior,”
“I am inferior,”
“I remember my pleasure,”
“I fear tomorrow.”

—this centre
loses its sustenance.

The self withers.

In that withering
there is vast freedom—
freedom to see,
freedom to love,
freedom to live without fear.

A mind free of psychological registration

is a mind that is innocent,
fresh,
alive.

Such a mind
knows what it means
to live without conflict.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, what do you mean by psychological registration?”

Questioner:
You often say the mind must not register psychologically.
But I don’t understand this.
What exactly do you mean

by psychological registration?

Teacher:
Madam, the brain must register certain things—
your name, your address,
the road you take to work,
your medical knowledge,
how to read and speak.

This factual registration is necessary for survival.

But the mind also registers insults,
flattery,
hurt,
praise,
moments of pleasure,
moments of fear.

This registration shapes
the image you have of yourself.

It is this psychological registration

that is dangerous.

It forms the "me,"
and where the "me" is,
there must be conflict.

"But why is registration harmful?"

Questioner:
What is wrong with remembering what happened yesterday—
a hurt, a compliment, a pleasant moment?

Why is that dangerous?

Teacher:
Because psychological registration
creates continuity of the past.

The mind says:

"I was hurt yesterday."
"I must not be hurt again."
"I was praised yesterday."
"I want to repeat that pleasure."

So, the mind is never free
to meet life as it is now.

It meets life through the screen of memory.

This memory becomes an image,
and the image becomes the observer.

Where there is an observer,
there is always conflict.

"Does this mean we should not remember anything?"

Questioner:
Are you asking us to erase memory,
to forget everything?

Teacher:
No, sir,
not at all.

We are talking only of psychological memory—

not factual memory.

You need factual memory
to function intelligently.

But psychological memory—
the continuation of hurt,
of pleasure,
of insult,
of sorrow—
is unnecessary.

It not only burdens the brain
but distorts perception.

You see life through the wounds

you have collected.

And the mind becomes old,
hard,
heavy.

“Why does a hurt stay with us?”

Questioner:
I understand what you’re saying,
but when someone hurts me,
it stays.
I can’t help it.
Why?

Teacher:
Because you are attentive
to the words that wounded you

only after the hurt has already taken root.

You do not observe the moment of impact
with complete attention.

If you watched the insult
the instant it was spoken—
with total awareness—
there would be no registration.

It is only in inattention
that the mind registers psychologically.

Inattention is the soil
in which hurt grows.

“Can hurt end without analysis?”

Questioner:
We are told we must talk about our hurts,
analyse them,
go into our childhood.
Is that not necessary?

Teacher:
Analysis implies time.
And during that time
the hurt continues.

Also, analysis divides you
into the analyser and the thing analysed.

But both are fragments of the same mind.

So, analysis can never end hurt.

Observation ends it—
instantaneously.

When you see hurt fully—
its origin,
its movement,
its falseness—
in a single movement of attention,
the hurt ends.

Instantly.

Observation is the flame

that burns away registration.

“Why do we cling to psychological memory?”

Questioner:
If registration causes harm,
why do we cling to it?
Why do we hold on to the past?

Teacher:
Because the past
gives continuity to the “me.”

Without registration,
there is no “me”
as you know it.

The “me” is a collection of hurts,
pleasures,
ambitions,

experiences.

So, the self defends its continuity
even at the cost of suffering.

The danger of registration
is that it strengthens
the illusion of a permanent self.

And where the self is strong,
there must be fear
and conflict.

“How does pleasure become dangerous?”

Questioner:
We understand that hurt is dangerous.
But why pleasure?
What harm is there in remembering something pleasant?

Teacher:
Pleasure is the opposite side of fear.

The pleasure of yesterday
creates the desire to repeat it tomorrow.

When pleasure is threatened,
fear arises.

So, pleasure and fear
are two ends of the same movement.

Psychological registration of pleasure
creates dependency,
attachment,

and ultimately sorrow.

To register pleasure
is to plant the seed of fear.

“What about relationships? Do we not naturally remember what was said?”

Questioner:
In relationship,
don’t we naturally remember
what someone said or did?

Teacher:
Of course, the brain records words.

But the danger is
what you do with that recording.

Do you interpret it?
Store it?
Carry it into tomorrow?

If you do,
your relationship is no longer with the person
but with memory.

Then the living relationship
becomes a dead thing.

We relate not to each other

but to our accumulated images.

And images cannot love.

“Can we really live without psychological registration?”

Questioner:
It sounds almost impossible
to live without registering psychologically.
Is it actually possible?

Teacher:
It is not only possible,
it is essential
if one is to live without conflict.

You can live without psychological registration
when there is complete attention.

Attention is the state
in which the mind is wholly present.

In attention:

- an insult ends with the word,
- a compliment ends with the moment,
- pleasure does not leave its trace,
- fear does not accumulate into tomorrow.

Attention is the fire
that burns away the residue of experience.

Where there is total attention,
the past does not accumulate.

“If the brain stops registering psychologically, what remains?”

Questioner:

If the mind stops storing hurts,
pleasures,
insults,
fears—
then what remains of the person?

Teacher:
A person is not destroyed.

What ends
is the burden
of the psychological past.

A mind free of registration
is innocent.
It is fresh,
untouched by yesterday.

Such a mind
is extraordinarily sensitive.

It sees beauty instantly,
loves instantly,
responds instantly.

It lives without the shadow
of accumulated memory.

This is not emptiness.
This is freedom.

The Hall Falls Silent

Teacher continued softly:

Sir, the tremendous danger
of psychological registration
is that it builds the self—
the centre of fear,
of sorrow,
of conflict.

When the mind sees this danger
not as an idea
but as a fact
as dangerous as a cobra—
then the very seeing
acts instantly.

In that instant
registration stops.

And a new mind is born—
a mind without burden,
without conflict,
without the shadow of yesterday.

Such a mind
is the foundation
of a different world.

The hall remained silent—
the silence of a mind
watching itself.

*****

Why Do You Hesitate?

Sir, when we hesitate,
when we pause before acting,
before seeing,
before telling the truth to ourselves,
there is a whole movement of the mind
hidden inside that hesitation.

It is not a small thing.

Hesitation reveals
fear,
conflict,
doubt,
attachment,
and the deep conditioning
that has shaped our consciousness.

To understand hesitation
is to understand the nature of the self.

Hesitation Means There Is Division

When you hesitate
you are torn between two movements:

- what you actually see,
- and what you think you should do.

Between the fact
and the desire.

Between clarity
and conditioning.

This division creates conflict,
and conflict expresses itself
as hesitation.

A mind in conflict
is never swift,
never clear,
never free.

Hesitation Shows Fear Is Operating

What is fear telling you
when you hesitate?

- You fear losing something— status, approval, comfort.
- You fear making a mistake— which means you are seeking psychological security.
- You fear the unknown— so you cling to what is familiar.

Fear slows down perception,
weakens intelligence,
creates confusion.

When fear operates,
you cannot act from clarity.

Fear is time,

and hesitation is the shadow of time.

Hesitation Is Born of Comparison

You hesitate

because you compare:

“What will others think?”
“What is the right choice?”
“Will this improve me?”
“Will it bring reward?”

Comparison paralyses the mind.

In comparison
there is no direct seeing.

A mind that compares
does not understand;
it only measures.

Where comparison exists,
hesitation is inevitable.

Hesitation Comes from the Image You Have of Yourself

You hesitate
because you are protecting an image—
the image of who you think you are
or who you think you should be.

This image
is sustained by memory:

- the fear of failing,
- the desire to succeed,
- the need to be respected.

When action threatens this image,
the “me” immediately steps in
and hesitation begins.

Hesitation is the defence of the self.

You Hesitate Because You Do Not See the Fact Completely

When you see something clearly—
utterly, wholly—
there is no hesitation.

The clarity itself
acts.

Like avoiding a snake on the path—
there is no debate,
no inner discussion,
no delay.

The moment there is hesitation,
it means the seeing is partial.

Where there is partial seeing,
thought enters
and brings confusion.

Hesitation Means Truth Has Not Been Fully Seen

Truth has its own action.

When the truth of something
is seen completely—

the truth of violence,
the truth of fear,
the truth of attachment,

the truth of sorrow—

the action is immediate.

There is no “should,”
no “must,”
no “perhaps.”

If you hesitate,
it means truth has not been seen wholly.

Hesitation reveals
that thought is interfering.

A Mind Free of Hesitation Is a Mind Free of Conflict

Such a mind is not rash,
nor impulsive,
nor reckless.

It is clear.

It sees,
and the seeing is action.

This action is not personal;
it has no motive;
it has no reward.

It is the action of intelligence.

The Ending of Hesitation Is the Ending of the Observer

When the structure of hesitation
is watched closely—

without judgement,
without wishing to end it—
the whole movement of fear,
comparison,
desire,
and self-protection
reveals itself.

And in that revelation,
hesitation ends.

Not through discipline
but through insight.

Insight dissolves the observer—
the centre that hesitates.

When the observer ends,
action becomes whole,
complete,
beautiful.

Such action is the flowering of intelligence.

The Immense Beauty of a Mind That Does Not Hesitate

It is a mind that is:

- quiet,
- alert,
- sensitive,
- free of fear,
- free of self-concern,
- free of yesterday's weight.

It acts out of clarity,

out of compassion,
out of deep understanding.

This is the mind that lives,
not hesitates.

This is the mind that loves.

And this is the mind
that can meet life fully—
from moment to moment.

***

A Dialogue

"Sir, why do I hesitate?"

Questioner:
When I see something clearly—
a truth,
a problem in my relationship,
a false movement within myself—
I still hesitate to act.
Why is that?

Teacher:
Sir, when there is hesitation,
there is conflict.

And conflict arises
only when there is division—
between what you see
and what you want.

Between the fact

and the idea.

Between clarity
and fear.

Let us explore this together,
not as teacher and student,
but as two human beings
trying to understand themselves.

“Is my hesitation a form of fear?”

Questioner:
Yes, I feel fear.
Fear of consequences,
fear of losing something,
fear of being wrong.
Is hesitation rooted in fear?

Teacher:
Naturally.

When you are afraid,
you cannot act wholly.

Fear enters as thought
and slows the mind,
clouds perception,
paralyses movement.

Fear says:
“What will happen to me?”
“What will others think?”
“Will I make a mistake?”

So, the mind clings to the known,
to the familiar,
and therefore, hesitates before action.

Fear is time,

and time is hesitation.

“But sometimes I hesitate because I want to do the right thing.”

Questioner:
Is hesitation always wrong?
Sometimes I hesitate
because I want to act correctly.

Teacher:
When you “want to act correctly,”
you are acting from an idea,
a conclusion,
a standard.

The moment you compare
what is happening
with what you think
ought to happen,
you create conflict.

Where there is conflict,
there must be hesitation.

Right action
is not born of comparison
but of direct perception.

If you see the truth clearly,
action is immediate.

If you hesitate,
you have not seen clearly.

“Is hesitation connected to the image I have of myself?”

Questioner:
I feel I hesitate
because I am worried about
how others see me.
Is it the image I am protecting?

Teacher:
Of course.

You hesitate
because action threatens
the image you have built
of yourself.

The image says:

“I must not fail.”
“I must appear wise.”
“I must maintain harmony.”
“I must be respected.”

This image is the past,
the residue of psychological memory.

To protect this image,
you hesitate.

So, hesitation
is the defence of the self.

Where the self is strong,

hesitation is constant.

“Does hesitation mean I haven’t understood something fully?”

Questioner:
If I truly understood a thing,
would I still hesitate?

Teacher:
When you see something completely,
there is no hesitation.

Take a simple example:

If you see a snake on the path,
is there any hesitation?

You do not say,
“Should I move away?
Let me think about it.”

The seeing is the action.

Similarly,
when the truth of something psychological
is seen entirely—
the truth of fear,
or jealousy,
or dependence—

the very seeing

transforms it.

The hesitation indicates
that you have partially seen it,
partially understood it.

Where there is partial seeing,
thought interferes.
And thought is always confused.

“Why does thought interfere?”

Questioner:
Why can’t I simply see?
Why does thought interfere
and complicate everything?

Teacher:
Because thought operates
from memory,
from experience,
from the past.

When you face a moment
that demands clarity,
thought rushes in with:

“What if…?”
“Suppose…?”
“Perhaps later…”
“Is this right…?”

Thought hesitates
because thought is uncertain.

Thought is weighed down by yesterday.

Clarity belongs to the present.

Thought belongs to the past.

This contradiction
creates hesitation.

“Is it possible to act without hesitation?”

Questioner:
Is there such a thing as
action without hesitation,
without fear,
without conflict?

Teacher:
Yes, sir.

Such action arises
when the mind sees
the whole movement of hesitation:

- the fear beneath it,
- the comparison that sustains it,
- the image that protects itself,
- the desire for security,
- the influence of past memory.

When you observe hesitation
completely—
without trying to end it,
without judging it—
you begin to understand
its structure.

And understanding
is immediate action.

Insight leaves no space for hesitation.

“Does this require discipline or will?”

Questioner:
Do I need to discipline myself
to stop hesitating?
To force myself to act?

Teacher:
No.

Discipline implies suppression.
Suppression is another form of fear.

And fear will always return.

We are not talking about willpower,
determination,
or overcoming hesitation.

We are talking about
seeing the total structure
of hesitation.

In that total seeing
the whole movement ends.

Not because of discipline—
but because the mind
is no longer deceived by it.

Insight, not effort,
brings freedom.

“What is the mind like when hesitation ends?”

Questioner:
If hesitation ends,
how does the mind function?
What is its quality?

Teacher:
A mind without hesitation
is extraordinarily clear.

It is not rushing.
It is not impulsive.
It is not aggressive.

It sees directly,
and the seeing is the action.

Such a mind is:

- free of comparison,
- free of conclusion,
- free of the fear of mistakes,
- free of the burden of the "me."

This freedom
is intelligence.

This intelligence
acts in love.

It acts with sensitivity,
with precision,
with compassion.

Such action
is whole,
complete.

The Hall Falls into Stillness

Teacher spoke softly:

Sir, when you hesitate,
you are torn between past and present.

Between fear and clarity.
Between the known and the unknown.

To observe hesitation
is to observe the movement of the self.

And in that observation
the self begins to dissolve.

When the self is quiet,
there is clarity.

In clarity,
there is no hesitation.

In that clarity
action is complete,
beautiful,
whole.

And a mind that acts from clarity
is a mind that loves.

The hall remained still—
as though the silence itself
had understood.

*****

Giving complete attention

Sir, Giving complete attention is one of the most simple things in the world—and one of the rarest.

We know what it is to look,
we know what it is to focus,
but we hardly ever give ourselves wholly to anything.

When Krishnamurti speaks of complete attention, he is pointing to a different quality of mind:
a mind that is entirely present, undivided, without the shadow of "me" interfering.

Let's explore it slowly.

We Usually Live in Fragments

If you watch your own mind during the day, you will see:

- You are listening to someone and at the same time thinking of something else.
- You are looking at a tree while carrying on an inner commentary: "How lovely… it needs water… I remember that place…"
- You read a book but your mind drifts into memories and worries.
- You pray, meditate, repeat mantras— yet your heart and mind are elsewhere.

This is partial attention:
a little bit of energy here, a little bit of energy there—
never the whole of you.

In this fragmented state, nothing goes very deep.

You hear words, but they don't touch the root.
You look, but you don't really see.

Where there is fragmentation, there can be no complete attention.

What Is Complete Attention?

Complete attention is a state in which:

- The senses are fully awake,
- The mind is not wandering,
- The heart is not weighed down by fear or motive,
- There is no centre saying, "I must attend."

There is only pure watching, pure listening, pure being with.

You are:

- wholly with the sound of the bird,
- wholly with the patient in front of you,
- wholly with the feeling in your own mind,
- wholly with the question being asked.

In that state, the mind is not divided between:

- "What is"
  and
- "What I think should be."

There is no conflict inside, and therefore no distortion.

Complete attention is wholeness in action.

Attention Is Not Concentration

- Concentration is exclusion. It says, “I will focus on this and push everything else away.” There is effort, tension, control.
- Attention is inclusion. It says, “I will be aware of the whole movement.” There is no forcing, no strain.

In concentration, there is always a centre:

“I am concentrating.”

This centre is constantly resisting distraction:

- “This thought must not come.”
- “I must not think of that.”
- “I must stay focused.”

So, in concentration there is the concentrator and the thing concentrated upon.
That division is already conflict.

In complete attention, there is no such division.

Thought may arise, a sound may pass, a sensation may appear—
all of it is simply seen, heard, felt, without resistance.

Nothing is pushed away; nothing is clung to.
The whole field is lit.

Complete Attention Has No Motive

You cannot give complete attention if you have a motive like:

- “I will attend so that my fear disappears.”
- “I will attend so that I become enlightened.”
- “I will attend to gain inner peace.”

- “I will attend so I can be a better person.”

The moment there is a motive, the mind is divided:
- one part watching the fact,
- another part secretly looking at the result.

A divided mind cannot attend.

Complete attention is like the openness of a child watching an ant:
no reward, no becoming, no spiritual ambition—just seeing.

This purity of looking gives attention an extraordinary strength.

In Complete Attention, the Observer Fades

Ordinarily, we say:
- “I am angry.”
- “I am watching my anger.”
- “I am trying to understand myself.”

There is the observer and the observed.

But, if you watch carefully during a moment of real, intense attention,
you will see something remarkable:
- The “I” that says “I am watching” is itself another thought.
- The observer is just another fragment of the same mind it is watching.

When you see this fact, not as a theory but actually,
the observer loses its authority.

Then, in complete attention, there is no watcher and the watched.
There is only seeing.

This is not mystical. It is very simple:

When you are fully attentive to a sunset,
for a second there is no “me enjoying the sunset”—
there is only the blazing sky.

When you completely watch a patient in pain,
for a moment there is no “me the doctor” and “him the patient”—
there is only pain observed, only care.

That wholeness is complete attention.

Complete Attention Ends the Problem

When you give complete attention to something:

- to fear,
- to loneliness,
- to jealousy,
- to hurt,
- to the movement of thought itself,

you are not trying to change it,
not trying to escape,
not trying to control.

You are simply watching it totally.

In that total seeing:

- the structure of fear is revealed,
- the root of jealousy is exposed,

- the nature of hurt is understood.

And understanding is already the beginning of ending.

You do not say:
"I understand, now what should I do?"

The very seeing is the doing.

JK would say:

"The seeing is the action."

Because in complete attention:

- there is no gap between insight and response,
- no gap between perception and action,
- no duality between understanding and living.

Attention Is Immediate, Not Gradual

You cannot practise complete attention.

Practice means:

- time,
- repetition,
- a method,
- a practiser who wants to become something.

But the practiser is still the old "me"—
ambitious, fearful, hoping to achieve a result.

Time does not lead to attention.

Attention comes in a flash when the mind sees:

- the danger of inattention, and

- the beauty of being wholly present.

Like how you instantly pay full attention when a child is about to fall,
or when a car suddenly swerves towards you.

In daily life too, when you see the truth
that inattention breeds hurt, conflict, misunderstanding—
and that attention is love—
then attention begins to flower naturally.

Complete Attention Is Silence

When the mind is fully attentive,
it is completely still—not dull, not blank, but alertly silent.

This silence is not enforced.
It is not created by pushing away thoughts.

It is the silence that comes when:

- conflict ends,
- the watcher is not separate from the watched,
- fear and desire are not guiding attention.

In this silence:

- perception is extraordinarily sharp,
- sensitivity is heightened,
- the heart is open.

This silence has its own sacredness.
It is not belonging to any religion, any guru, any tradition.

It is the silence of a mind that is whole.

Attention Is Love

When you give complete attention to:

- a child who is afraid,
- a patient who is suffering,
- a tree in the wind,
- your own wounded mind,

you are not judging, measuring, condemning, or using.

You are simply with.

In that state, there is no self-centred movement.

And that absence of self-interest
is what JK would call love.

Not sentiment, not dependence, not attachment—
but the natural compassion of a mind that is present.

In complete attention:

- there is no "me" and "you,"
- there is only this extraordinary sense of being together with what is.

That is love.

How to Begin?

Not with a method.

But with simple, quiet noticing:

- When someone speaks to you, really listen. See how the mind wants to rush in; notice it, and come back to listening.

- When a feeling of irritation arises, watch it closely—the sensation in the body, the thoughts forming, the impulse to react.
- When you walk alone, see if it is possible to just watch— the sound of footsteps, the sky, the breath, without naming, without drifting.

Don't make it into a new discipline or "spiritual exercise". Just see.

The more you see, the more attention flowers by itself.

So, giving complete attention is:

- to be wholly with what is,
- with no motive,
- no division,
- no controller,
- no interference of "me".

It is the pure flame of awareness.

Where that flame burns,
confusion ends,
fear loses its grip,
and life is met freshly,
from moment to moment.

***

A Dialogue

"Sir, what does it mean to give complete attention?"

Questioner:
You often speak of attention—not concentration, not effort, but something whole, something total.

What does it really mean
to give complete attention?

Teacher:
Madam, complete attention
is perhaps one of the simplest things in life,
and therefore, one of the rarest.

Complete attention means
the mind is wholly present—
not distracted,
not comparing,
not interpreting,
not resisting.

It is a state in which
there is no centre saying,
"I must attend."

There is only attention—
pure, simple, direct.

"Is attention the same as concentration?"

Questioner:
Is this not what we do in school—
focus on a book,
a lesson,
a task?
Is that not attention?

Teacher:
No, sir.
That is concentration.

Concentration is exclusion.
It says:

"I will focus on this
and push everything else away."

In concentration
there is effort,
tension,
control.

The "me" is very active in concentration:

"I must not be distracted."
"I must succeed."
"I must control my mind."

Where there is effort,
there is always the shadow of conflict.

Attention has no effort.
It is effortless alertness.

"Why is effort absent in complete attention?"

Questioner:
This seems difficult.
How can attention be effortless?

Teacher:
When you see something truly dangerous—
a cobra on the path—
do you make an effort to pay attention?

Or does attention happen instantly?

Effort exists only
when there is resistance.

Where there is clarity,
attention is immediate.

Complete attention comes naturally
when the mind sees something clearly.

“Why do we rarely give complete attention?”

Questioner:
If attention is natural,
why do we almost never live in that state?

Teacher:
Because our minds are fragmented.

When you listen to someone,
you are also:

- remembering something,
- comparing what is said with what you already know,
- judging,
- anticipating your reply,
- thinking about yesterday,
- planning for tomorrow.

Outwardly you listen,
inwardly you wander.

Fragmentation prevents attention.

To give complete attention
is to drop, even for a moment,

the whole movement of the past.

“But isn’t the mind always thinking?”

Questioner:
My mind never stops.
Thought keeps interfering.
Is complete attention possible
with this constant stream of thinking?

Teacher:
Thought is inevitable in daily living.
You need it to function.

But thought need not interfere
in observing the present.

When you listen completely,
thought becomes quiet
of its own accord.

You do not suppress it.
You do not push it away.

You watch it,
and because you watch it
without resistance,
it subsides.

Awareness of thought
is the ending of its interference.

“Can attention be cultivated through practice?”

Questioner:

Can we practise attention?
Meditation techniques say
we must train the mind.

Teacher:
Sir, practice implies time.
And what you practise
becomes mechanical.

Attention cannot be mechanical.

If you practise attention,
there is always the one who practises—
the "me" who wants to become attentive.

That "me" is the very source of inattention.

Complete attention comes
not through discipline
but through understanding
the nature of distraction.

When you see the whole structure
of inattention,
attention is there—
naturally, effortlessly.

"So how does one begin?"

Questioner:
Then how do I begin
to give complete attention?

Teacher:
You begin by watching

your inattention.

When someone is speaking,
see how quickly the mind
moves away.

When you walk,
see how the mind runs
to memories, fantasies, worries.

When a feeling arises—
anger, pleasure, fear—
observe how thought interferes.

This observation
is the beginning of attention.

Awareness of inattention
is attention.

“Is attention possible with strong emotions?”

Questioner:
When I am angry or afraid,
attention disappears.
Is complete attention possible
during strong emotions?

Teacher:
Yes.

Complete attention
is most needed
when emotion arises.

But usually,
you condemn the emotion,
or justify it,
or explain it.

You never simply watch it.

If you observe anger
the moment it arises—
the sensation in the body,
the tightening of the jaw,
the quickening of breath—
you will see that attention
changes its nature.

Complete attention
does not suppress emotion.
It transforms it.

The energy of anger
is absorbed into awareness
and becomes clarity.

“Is complete attention related to intelligence?”

Questioner:
You speak of intelligence often.
Is complete attention
the same as intelligence?

Teacher:
Attention is intelligence.

Where there is complete attention,
there is no confusion,

no conflict,
no self-centred movement.

Intelligence is not cleverness,
not knowledge,
not logic.

Intelligence is seeing
what is true
in the moment it unfolds.

Complete attention
is the flowering of intelligence.

“Does this attention bring freedom?”

Questioner:
If one lives with complete attention,
what changes inwardly?

Teacher:
Everything changes.

When you attend completely:

- fear reveals its structure,
- jealousy dissolves in understanding,
- hurt loses its continuity,
- loneliness is seen without escape,
- pleasure is observed without attachment.

Attention is a light
that burns away confusion.

In that light,
the self—

with its ambitions, fears, images—
becomes quiet.

This quietness
is the real meditation.

In this quietness
there is freedom.

The Hall Falls into Deep Stillness

A profound silence filled the hall.
People were not thinking;
they were listening
to the movement of their own minds.

Teacher spoke softly:

Sir, complete attention
is not something to be achieved.

It is something to be understood.

If you see the dangers
of inattention—
hurt, conflict, separation—
attention comes naturally.

And in complete attention
there is no observer,
no centre,
no "me."

There is only
the pure flame of awareness.

In that flame
all confusion ends.

And from that ending
begins a different kind of life—
a life of clarity,
compassion,
and immense beauty.

The hall remained silent—
a silence not forced
but born of understanding.

*****

Are You Free?

Sir, the question “Are you free?”
is not a casual or philosophical question.
It is perhaps the most serious question
one can ask oneself.

Because on the answer to this question
depends the quality of your whole life—
your relationships,
your fears,
your actions,
your capacity to love,
and your understanding of the sacred.

Let us look at it slowly.

Freedom Is Not Doing What You Like

Most people think
freedom means choice:

- choosing your career,
- choosing your partner,
- choosing your beliefs,
- choosing your pleasures.

But choice exists only
when the mind is confused.

When you see something clearly,
there is no choice—
the clarity itself brings action.

So, freedom is not choice.

Freedom is the absence
of inner conflict.

If you are torn between desires,
between fear and pleasure,
between the ideal and the actual—
you are not free.

You are divided.

A divided mind
can never know freedom.

Are You Free from the Past?

Freedom means freedom from the past—
not from knowledge,
not from skill—
but from psychological memory.

The hurt of yesterday,
the pleasure of yesterday,
the insult of yesterday,
the fear of yesterday—
all these shape the “me.”

As long as the “me” operates,
you are not free.

You act from conditioning,
not from clarity.

You respond from habit,
not from intelligence.

The self is the past.

And a mind burdened with the past
cannot be free in the present.

Are You Free from Fear?

Can a mind that is frightened
ever be free?

Fear is woven into our lives:

- fear of not becoming,
- fear of losing,
- fear of loneliness,
- fear of death,
- fear of not being loved.

Fear shapes our choices,
our beliefs,
our relationships.

Fear makes us conform,
obey,
imitate.

Fear brings authority into being—
spiritual, political, psychological.

A mind caught in fear
cannot explore,
cannot learn,
cannot love.

To ask “Are you free?”

is to ask
“Are you free from fear?”

Are You Free from Desire and Its Pursuits?

Desire is constant movement:

“I want this.”
“I must keep that.”
“I must avoid this.”
“I must reach that.”

Desire breeds conflict—
struggle, effort, comparison, frustration.

When the mind is driven by desire,
it is never still.

It chases pleasure
and escapes pain.

Such a mind
is a prisoner of its own projections.

Freedom is not found
at the end of desire.
Freedom begins
when desire is understood.

Are You Free from Authority?

Not just political authority,
but inward authority:

- tradition,
- belief,

- spiritual teachers,
- scriptures,
- your own past experiences.

When you follow authority inwardly,
your mind imitates,
conforms,
repeats.

Authority destroys intelligence.

A free mind
looks,
examines,
questions,
observes
—not according to a standard or belief—
but from its own clarity.

Only such a mind can be free.

Are You Free from Hurt?

Every insult,
every unkind word,
every betrayal,
every disappointment
leaves a mark—
a psychological wound.

From that wound
arise fear,
defensiveness,
withdrawal,
violence.

As long as hurt remains,
freedom is impossible.

Freedom is the ending
of psychological registration.

To see the hurt directly,
without naming,
without judging,
without escaping—
is to free the mind
from its influence.

Are You Free from the Image You Have of Yourself?

We carry countless images:

- of who we think we are,
- of who we want to be,
- of who others think we are,
- of what we should become.

These images create conflict.

The image is never the fact.

The image is always in the past.

The image wants security, continuity, approval—
and therefore, creates fear.

If you are attached to your image,
you are not free.

Freedom begins

when the observer
sees that he is the image
and dissolves in that insight.

Freedom Is Not an Achievement

Freedom is not a distant ideal.
It is not something you arrive at
after years of practice.

Freedom is not a reward
for discipline or virtue.

Freedom is not found
through meditation techniques
or spiritual authority.

Freedom is the immediate perception
of truth.

It is now—
not tomorrow.

Freedom Is the Ending of the Self

The self—
with all its memories, fears, desires, hurts, ambitions—
is a burden.

When the movement of the self ends,
there is vast space in the mind.

In that space
there is complete attention.

In that attention
there is love.

Love and freedom
are inseparable.

To be free
is to live without the self
creating shadows in every action.

Are You Free Now?

Not theoretically.
Not ideally.
Not tomorrow.

Now.

Are you free
from fear,
from hurt,
from comparison,
from ambition,
from psychological memory,
from the endless movement
of becoming something?

If not,
then simply observe the fact.

Observe it without resistance,
without judgement,
without wanting to change it.

In that pure observation

is the beginning of freedom.

Because freedom
is not a goal—
it is a state of being
when the mind sees truth completely.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, how do I know if I am free?”

Questioner:
I have listened to you speak about freedom—
freedom from fear, from conditioning, from the past.
But, honestly, I do not know if I am free.
How does one find out?

Teacher:
Sir, to find out whether you are free,
you must observe your daily life—
your thoughts, your reactions, your relationships.

Freedom is not an abstraction.
It is not an ideal.
It is what you are from moment to moment.

If you are frightened,
if you are ambitious,
if you compare yourself with another,
if you seek approval,
if you cling to pleasure or memory—

you are not free.

This is not a judgement;
it is simply a fact.

Freedom begins when you look at the fact
without escape.

“Is freedom doing what one wants?”

Questioner:
Many people say that freedom means
doing what you like—
choosing your job, your lifestyle, your beliefs.
Is that real freedom?

Teacher:
Choice exists only when the mind is confused.

When you see something clearly,
there is no need for choice.

Clarity itself is action.

So, freedom is not choosing
between options created by thought.

Freedom is not doing what you want,
because the “you” that wants
is shaped by conditioning:

your culture,
your upbringing,
your fears,
your pleasures,
your ambitions.

The self that desires freedom
is itself a prison.

“Are we aware of our conditioning?”

Questioner:
You mention conditioning.
I hear the word often,
but I do not truly feel it.
What is conditioning?

Teacher:
From childhood,
you are told what to believe,
what to fear,
what to worship,
what success means,
what love means,
what is valuable.

Your mind becomes shaped
by these influences—
your family, your society, your religion,
your experiences, your education.

When you react,
you are reacting from this background.

This conditioned mind
cannot be free
because it sees everything
through the lens of the past.

Freedom is seeing the conditioning
and not being shaped by it.

“How do we look at our conditioning without judgement?”

Questioner:
When I look at myself,
I immediately judge what I see.
How can I look without condemning?

Teacher:
Judgement is another form of conditioning.

The moment you condemn,
you stop observing.

To look clearly
you must look without comparing,
without saying
“This is good,”
“This is bad,”
“I must change.”

Just observe.

In that pure observation
conditioning begins to lose its hold.

Seeing the fact
without distortion
is the beginning of freedom.

“Is fear the greatest obstacle to freedom?”

Questioner:
I see that I am afraid—

afraid of failure,
afraid of loneliness,
afraid of death.
Does fear prevent freedom?

Teacher:
A mind that is frightened
can never be free.

Fear narrows the mind,
paralyses action,
breeds dependence,
destroys love.

Fear is always about something—
something that might happen,
something that might return.

Fear is created by thought
projecting itself into the future.

Freedom comes
when you understand the whole structure
of fear.

Not by running from it,
not by suppressing it,
but by observing it
in the very moment it arises.

Seeing fear completely
is the ending of fear.

“Can we be free from desire?”

Questioner:
Desire seems to drive everything—
our ambitions, relationships, actions.
If we lose desire, won't we lose energy?

Teacher:
Desire is not energy;
it is a distortion of energy.

Desire always creates conflict:

"I want this."
"I can't have it."
"I may lose it."
"I must protect it."

This movement—
wanting, fearing, chasing, resisting—
exhausts the mind.

Freedom is not the suppression of desire
but the understanding of its nature:

how desire begins
in perception,
in sensation,
in the movement of thought
saying "I must have that again."

When you watch desire unfold
without judgement,
its fire burns itself out.

In that ending
there is immense energy—

the energy of clarity.

“Are we free in our relationships?”

Questioner:
In relationship,
I find I am always comparing,
seeking reassurance,
getting hurt.
Is it possible to be free there?

Teacher:
If you are not free in relationship,
you are not free anywhere.

Relationship reveals what you are:

your fears,
your attachments,
your loneliness,
your jealousies.

Psychological registration—
remembering every hurt,
every insult,
every pleasure—
makes relationship heavy and mechanical.

A free mind does not accumulate hurt.

It listens freshly
every moment.

Such listening
is love.

Without freedom,
relationship is merely attachment,
and attachment is fear.

“Is the self the barrier to freedom?”

Questioner:
You say the self is the source of conflict.
How do we understand this self?

Teacher:
The self is a bundle of memories:

your pleasures,
your fears,
your hurts,
your ambitions,
your knowledge,
your beliefs.

This self demands security,
continuity,
importance.

Where the self operates,
there must be conflict.

When the mind sees this whole movement
without escape,
without resistance,
the self loses its intensity.

When the self becomes quiet,
the mind is free—
free to see,
free to love,
free to be.

“Is freedom immediate or gradual?”

Questioner:
Can we become free gradually—
over years of meditation and practice?

Teacher:
Truth has no time.

If you see the truth
that the fire is hot,
you don’t gradually withdraw your hand.

You act instantly.

Similarly,
when you see the danger
of fear,
of comparison,
of becoming,
of psychological accumulation—

the seeing itself
is the ending.

Freedom is not a distant achievement.
It is the perception of truth
in the present moment.

The Hall Falls into Silence

Teacher continued:

Sir, to ask “Are you free?”
is to ask whether the mind
is burdened with yesterday.

It is to ask
whether fear still holds your heart,
whether hurt still shapes your behaviour,
whether comparison still poisons your relationships.

Freedom is not in the future.
It is not something to be achieved.

Freedom begins
when you look at yourself
without the distortion of desire or fear.

In that looking
the mind becomes astonishingly quiet.

In that quietness
there is clarity.

In that clarity
there is love.

And in that love
there is freedom.

The hall remained silent—
not the silence of effort,
but the silence born of listening.

*****

Escaping From Problems

Sir, human beings have cultivated countless ways
of escaping from their problems.

We escape through work,
through religion,
through entertainment,
through relationships,
through ideas,
through spiritual practices,
through knowledge,
through every kind of pleasure.

This constant movement away from "what is"
has become the very habit of the mind.

But escape—however refined—
never brings freedom.

It only strengthens the problem.

Why Do We Escape?

Observe your own mind.

When there is fear,
you immediately want comfort.

When there is loneliness,
you seek activity or companionship.

When there is hurt,
you run to distraction,

or cling to the memory of pleasure.

We escape because:

- the fact is painful,
- facing it feels overwhelming,
- the mind wants instant relief,
- thought promises comfort in avoidance.

But the problem remains—
waiting, accumulating energy,
returning with greater force.

Escape postpones the problem;

it never ends it.

Escape Prevents Understanding

A problem demands your full attention—
not your partial, distracted mind.

The moment you escape,
you stop learning.

Because learning requires
that you look directly,
without distortion.

But when you escape:

- you distort the problem,
- you cover it with explanations,
- you protect it with conclusions.

You never see the problem clearly.

And therefore, you remain a prisoner to it.

The More You Escape, the Bigger the Problem Becomes

Escape gives temporary relief—
like a drug.

But problems that are not understood
deepen over time.

Fear grows,
hurt becomes more entrenched,
loneliness becomes more aggressive,
jealousy becomes more cunning.

Every escape
is a postponement.

Postponement
is the nourishment of the problem.

The problem grows in the darkness

of your refusal to look.

Thought Itself Becomes the Escape

Thought is very clever.

Thought says:

- "Let me analyse the problem."
- "Let me find the cause."
- "Let me read a book about it."
- "Let me pray."
- "Let me meditate to escape this feeling."

All these look respectable,
but they are escapes.

Because the analyser is the problem.

Thought cannot solve fear,
because thought is fear.

Thought cannot solve loneliness,
because thought creates loneliness.

Any movement of thought
away from the fact
is an escape.

Escaping Creates the Illusion of Time

When you escape,
you create psychological time:

- "One day I will face it."
- "I will understand later."
- "Eventually I will overcome this."

But time does not heal fear,
nor hurt,
nor sorrow.

Time only prolongs conflict.

The problem lives in the present.

Escape pushes it into the future
—and the future is simply the continuity of the present.

Facing the Problem Is the Ending of the Problem

A problem ends
only when you face it with:

- complete attention,
- no condemnation,
- no justification,
- no escape.

If you look at fear
as you would look at a sunset—
quietly, totally, without the movement of desire—
you will see its nature.

And in seeing,
fear dissolves.

Because when you see the whole of something,
you also see its ending.

Understanding is the ending.

Escape Strengthens the Self

Escape is always about protecting the "me":

- the "me" that is afraid of being hurt,
- the "me" that wants comfort,
- the "me" that wants to avoid conflict.

This movement of escape
is the movement of the self.

But the self
is the problem.

Therefore, escape is not only futile—
it nourishes the very centre of conflict.

Facing a problem
requires the ending of the self's interference.

It is the self that hesitates,
the self that fears,
the self that resists.

When the self is absent,
the problem is simple—
and simplicity ends the problem.

To Face a Problem Completely Is to Give It Total Attention

When you give total attention—
there is no centre that wants to change the fact.

Attention means:

- you observe without choice,
- your senses are awake,
- your mind is still,
- there is no movement of escape.

In that attention,
the problem reveals its structure.

It begins to unfold itself.

It shows you:

- how it began,
- how it sustains itself,
- how thought keeps feeding it.

This revelation
is the dissolution.

Attention is the flame
that ends the darkness of escape.

When Escape Ends, Freedom Begins

The mind that does not escape
is utterly simple,
utterly clear.

It meets life directly—
without fear,
without resistance,
without the burden of yesterday.

Such a mind is free.

Not free to "do what it wants,"
but free from the compulsions
of fear, conditioning, authority,
and the endless pursuit of pleasure.

Freedom is not in escape.
Freedom is in seeing.

Seeing the problem wholly,
without the interference of the self.

***

A Dialogue

"Sir, why do we always run away from our problems?"

Questioner:
Whenever I face fear, loneliness, or conflict,
my immediate reaction is to escape—
to distract myself,
to seek comfort,
to do something that takes me away from the problem.
Why does the mind always run?

Teacher:
Sir, the mind escapes
because the problem is painful.
The fact is too disturbing,
too demanding.

So, the mind moves away—
into an activity,
a belief,
a memory,
a future hope.

Escape is easier
than looking at the fact.

But the moment you escape,
you strengthen the very problem
you are trying to avoid.

"So, escape is the cause of more suffering?"

Questioner:
Are you saying, then,
that escape itself creates further suffering?

Teacher:

Precisely.

When you escape from fear,
the fear is still there—
waiting, accumulating,
returning with greater force.

When you escape from loneliness,
you only postpone it.

When you escape from hurt,
you carry that hurt quietly within you—
like a wound you refuse to clean.

Escape never ends the problem.
It only covers it,
like putting a blanket over a fire
that continues to burn underneath.

“But some escapes seem harmless—music, reading, conversation.”

Questioner:
What is wrong with escaping into music, books,
or meeting friends?
These seem harmless, even healthy.

Teacher:
There is nothing wrong
with listening to music
or reading a book
or being with friends.

But when these become escapes,
when they become a way

to avoid looking at yourself,
to avoid facing fear or sorrow—
then even the most beautiful activity
becomes a movement away from truth.

The beauty is used
to cover the ugliness inside.

That covering
is the beginning of disorder.

“Why do we find it so difficult to look directly at a problem?”

Questioner:
Why can’t I just look at my fear
without running away?
Why does it feel impossible?

Teacher:
Because looking demands energy—
a tremendous, intense energy.

Escape dissipates energy.
Escape is easy, mechanical.

To face a problem wholly,
you need attention.

Attention means
you are fully present with the fact—
not with your interpretations,
not with your justifications,
not with your analysis.

To observe fear
without wanting to get rid of it
requires a mind that is very still,
very quiet,
very clear.

Most of us have never looked that way.

“Is analysis also an escape?”

Questioner:
Many psychologists tell us
to analyse our problems—
to trace them back to childhood,
to examine their roots.

Is analysis itself an escape?

Teacher:
Often, yes.

Analysis implies time—
tomorrow, next week, next month.

But the problem exists now.

And during the time you are analysing,
the problem continues.

Further, analysis divides the observer
from the thing observed.

“I” analyse my fear.

But the “I” is part of that fear.

The analyser is the analysed.

So, analysis usually becomes
another refined escape.

Observation—immediate, direct—
has nothing to do with analysis.

Observation is now;
analysis is time.

“Do religions become an escape too?”

Questioner:
Many people say
they find comfort in religion,
in prayer,
in belief.
Is that also an escape?

Teacher:
It can be.

Belief gives comfort,
and where there is comfort
there is no inquiry.

When you cling to belief
to avoid fear,
you are escaping—
not understanding.

When you pray for help
because you do not want to face sorrow,

you are escaping.

Religion, belief, ritual—
if used as escape—
prevent understanding of the self.

And without understanding the self
there can be no freedom.

“How can we stop escaping?”

Questioner:
Sir, if escape is so ingrained in us,
how can we end it?

Teacher:
By becoming aware of it.

When you escape
and you know you are escaping—
that very awareness
begins to end the escape.

Escaping is mechanical.
Awareness is living.

So, the moment you are aware
of the urge to distract yourself—
to turn on music,
to scroll your phone,
to talk unnecessarily,
to occupy yourself—
just watch that urge.

Do not condemn it.

Do not justify it.
Just watch.

In that watching,
you learn about the movement of escape.

And learning ends escape.

“What happens when we face a problem directly?”

Questioner:
If I do not escape,
if I look at the problem directly,
what happens?

Teacher:
When you face a problem completely,
without the movement of escape,
you give the problem
your full attention.

Attention is like a flame—
bright, intense, unbroken.

In that attention,
the problem unfolds itself.

It shows you its structure:
how it began,
how thought sustains it,
how memory strengthens it.

This understanding
is immediate action.

The problem ends
because you have looked at it wholly.

The seeing is the ending.

“Does this mean the self is the source of escape?”

Questioner:
Is it the “me” that escapes?
Is the self the root of the problem?

Teacher:
The self is the problem.

The self wants to be safe,
protected,
comforted.

The self cannot face pain—
so, it escapes.

Every escape
strengthens the self.

And the self,
being a movement of memory and thought,
is always in conflict.

When the self becomes quiet
through direct observation,
escape has no place.

The mind meets life directly.

“When we stop escaping, do problems dissolve completely?”

Questioner:
If we truly stop escaping,
does every problem disappear?

Teacher:
Yes—
not the practical problems,
but the psychological ones.

Practical problems—
engineering, surgery, mathematics—
require thought, skill, knowledge.

But psychological problems
exist only because we refuse to look.

When there is no escape,
no suppression,
no analysis,
no justification—
only observation—

psychological problems
dissolve.

They dissolve
because their root is ignorance—
ignorance of oneself.

The Hall Falls into Silence

Teacher spoke softly:

Sir, the mind that escapes
lives perpetually in confusion.

The mind that faces the fact—
without the movement of fear—
is free.

Freedom is not the result
of struggle or discipline.

Freedom comes
when you see the whole movement
of escape.

And in that seeing
there is an immediate ending.

In that ending
the mind becomes simple—
clear, innocent, alive.

Such a mind
can meet life wholly,
without conflict.

It is only such a mind
that knows what it means
to live without sorrow.

The hall remained silent—
the silence of minds
watching themselves.

*****

What Will Save Man?

Sir, when we ask,
“What will save man?”
we are already moving in a false direction.

Because the moment you seek something
to save you—
a method,
a belief,
a guru,
a system,
a political ideology,
a technological advance,
a spiritual practice—

you have placed salvation
outside yourself.

And whatever is outside you
becomes authority,
and authority is corruption.

So, the question itself
must be approached with great care.

No External Agency Will Save Man

Nothing outside—
no religion,
no scripture,
no leader,
no saviour,
no nation,

no scientific breakthrough—
will save man.

Human beings have been trying these
for thousands of years.

Every attempt has ended in division:

- religion vs. religion,
- nation vs. nation,
- ideology vs. ideology,
- guru vs. guru,
- belief vs. belief.

Dependence breeds fear,
fear breeds obedience,
obedience breeds disorder.

To expect salvation
from outside
is to perpetuate the very confusion
we seek to escape.

Thought Will Not Save Man

Thought has built extraordinary things—
airplanes, hospitals, art, mathematics.

But thought is always limited.

Thought is born of memory,
and memory is always partial.

When thought enters the realm of relationship,
when thought tries to solve sorrow,
fear,

violence,
ambition,
jealousy—

it creates more disorder.

Because thought itself
is the creator of these problems.

What is limited
cannot bring about
an unlimited transformation.

Knowledge Will Not Save Man

Knowledge is essential in the technological world,
but knowledge is always incomplete.

Knowledge is the past.
And the past shapes the self.

Knowledge divides:

- "I know, you do not."
- "My experience is superior to yours."
- "My belief is true, yours is false."

A mind burdened with knowledge
cannot see freshly.

Only a fresh mind
is capable of innocence, goodness, love.

Knowledge cannot save man—
because knowledge is not wisdom.

Time Will Not Save Man

We believe that eventually
we will become better—
more peaceful,
more loving,
more compassionate.

This is the great illusion
that sustains disorder.

Time does not heal psychological wounds.

Time does not purify the mind.

Time only prolongs conflict.

If you are violent today
and promise to become nonviolent tomorrow,
the tomorrow is still violence.

Transformation is now
or not at all.

Escape Will Not Save Man

Human beings run endlessly:

- into pleasure,
- into entertainment,
- into prayer,
- into meditation as escape,
- into ideals,
- into intoxication,
- into work.

But escape never ends suffering.
Escape only strengthens suffering.

To escape from fear
is to nourish fear.

To escape from loneliness
is to deepen loneliness.

What you run from
follows you everywhere.

What Will Save Man Is the Ending of the Self

The self—
with its fears,
desires,
ambitions,
jealousies,
hurts,
pursuits,
attachments—
is the source of human misery.

The self is the centre of division:

- between man and man,
- between nation and nation,
- between religion and religion,
- between belief and belief,
- between the past and the present.

The self isolates itself
and therefore, creates conflict.

When the self ends—

not through discipline,
not through control,
not through suppression,
but through deep understanding—
there comes a freedom
that is untouched by time.

In that freedom
there is no fear.

Where there is no fear
there is love.

And love
—not ideas, not beliefs—
is the only thing
that can save man.

What Will Save Man Is Attention

Not partial attention,
not scattered attention,
not disciplined attention—
but complete, choiceless attention.

A mind that observes itself
without judgement,
without comparison,
without condemnation
is a mind that understands.

Attention reveals the whole movement
of thought and feeling.

In that revelation

there is freedom.

Attention is the light
in which the self dissolves.

What Will Save Man Is the Awakening of Intelligence

Not cleverness,
not knowledge,
not cunning.

Intelligence is the flame born of awareness.

Intelligence does not belong to an individual.

It is not personal.

It is the seeing of what is true
in the moment of seeing.

Where intelligence is,
there is compassion.

Where compassion is,
there is no fragmentation.

A mind filled with compassion
cannot harm.

Such a mind
is the salvation of humanity.

What Will Save Man Is a Radical Transformation of the Mind

Not gradual improvement,
not polishing the self,
not adding virtues,
not practising ideals.

Radical transformation means:

- the ending of fear,
- the ending of hurt,
- the ending of psychological time,
- the ending of becoming,
- the ending of authority,
- the ending of comparison,
- the ending of escape.

In this ending
there is a tremendous beginning—
a mind completely fresh,
completely innocent,
completely alive.

Such a mind
creates a new world.

So, What Will Save Man?

Not religion.
Not philosophy.
Not politics.
Not science.
Not technology.
Not meditation techniques.
Not gurus.
Not institutions.
Not progress.

What will save man
is the awakening of a mind
that sees clearly.

A mind free of the self.

A mind that can love.

A mind that can look at life
without the shadow of fear.

A mind that is totally attentive.

This is the only revolution.

The only salvation.

The only true beginning.

*****

Life and Death Go Together

Sir, we have been conditioned for millennia to think
that life is on one side
and death is on the other—
separated by time,
separated by fear,
separated by the attachment to "me"
and all that "me" has gathered.

But this division
between life and death
is the creation of thought.

In reality,
they are not two separate movements.
They are one movement.

Life and death
are not opposites.
They are inseparable,
like the shadow that follows the tree,
like the tide that moves with the moon.

Death Is Not the End of Life—It Is Part of Life

For us, death means:

- the ending of the body,
- the ending of relationships,
- the ending of experience,
- the ending of everything we have collected psychologically.

So, we resist it.

We push it to the very end of our life.
We refuse to look at it.

But death is not something
that happens at the last moment.

Death is happening all the time.

Every moment that ends
dies.

Every thought that finishes
has died.

Every pleasure and every sorrow
are born and die.

Life is a continuous movement
of birth and ending.

To see this
is to be free of fear.

Fear Divides Life from Death

Thought creates fear by saying:

“Life is mine.
Death is the enemy.”

So, we cling to life
as continuity,
as accumulation,
as becoming something.

And we resist death
as destruction,
as loss,
as annihilation.

But what we fear losing
is the psychological structure
we have built around ourselves:

- our memories,
- our experiences,
- our hopes,
- our hurts,
- our attachments,
- our successes.

It is the “me”
that is afraid of ending.

The “me” is afraid
because the “me” is the continuity of memory.

If there were no “me,”
there would be no fear of death.

To Live Fully Is to Die Every Day

Living is not merely breathing,
thinking, working, reproducing, surviving.

Living means
to meet each moment fresh—
without the burden of yesterday.

And this freshness
is only possible

when there is the ending of the past.

This is death.

To die to every pleasure
as it ends,
to die to every hurt
before it leaves a scar,
to die to every belief
the moment you see its limitation—

this dying
is living.

To live fully
is to die continuously
inwardly.

Then life and death
are one movement,
not two separate events.

Death Is the Ending of Accumulation

We accumulate endlessly:

- possessions,
- knowledge,
- experiences,
- memories,
- images about ourselves and others.

And this accumulation
we call living.

But accumulation makes the mind heavy.

It dulls sensitivity.
It breeds fear of loss.

Death is the ending
of accumulation.

If you can end accumulation psychologically
while living—
end the burden of hurt,
end the pursuit of becoming,
end the image you carry about yourself—
then death is not something to fear.

Death becomes
the renewal of the mind.

Life Without Death Becomes Corruption

A mind that refuses to die to the past
becomes stale,
mechanical,
repetitive.

It lives in patterns,
traditions,
beliefs,
fears.

Such a mind is not living;
it is merely functioning.

Life without inner death
is corruption—
the continuation of psychological residue.

Death without life
is emptiness.

But life and death together
make renewal.

In the Ending There Is the Beginning

Death is ending.

Ending of:

- attachment,
- dependency,
- hurt,
- ambition,
- fear,
- the craving for more.

Where there is an ending
there is a beginning.

The new can only come
when the old ends.

A mind that ends every day
is innocent.

It is fresh.

It meets life without distortion.

This mind has no fear of death
because it dies every moment.

The Mind That Lives with Death Is a Mind Without Fear

When you see
that life and death walk side by side—
not as enemies,
but as partners—
fear dissolves.

Fear exists
only when you cling to continuity.

When continuity ends,
there is immense freedom.

To live with death
is to love.

Because love has no continuity,
no possession,
no tomorrow.

Love is always new.

A mind that understands death
knows what love is.

Death Is Not Destruction—It Is Creation

Ending is creation.

When you end a thought completely,
you can see clearly.

When you end a belief completely,

intelligence awakens.

When you end fear completely,
love appears.

Death is the womb of creation.

Without death
there is no life.

Life and death
are like the inhalation and exhalation
of the same breath.

You cannot separate them.

So, what does it mean that life and death go together?

It means:

- to live without fear,
- to die to the past every moment,
- to let go of psychological accumulation,
- to allow endings to happen naturally,
- to meet each moment fresh,
- to see that the "me" is the source of fear,
- to understand love without attachment.

In such a mind,
life and death are not enemies.

They are a single, flowing movement—
the movement of creation and ending,
of renewal and profound silence.

Where life and death are one,

there is peace.

There is beauty.

There is freedom.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, you often say life and death are one. How can that be?”

Questioner:
To me, life means living—
relationships, work, family, joy, sorrow.
And death is the end of all that.
How can they ever be together?

Teacher:
Madam, we are conditioned from childhood
to separate life from death—
to think of life as continuity
and death as termination.

But this division exists only in thought.

Look carefully,
and you will see
that life and death are not opposites.
They are part of a single movement.

Life is not merely continuity.
Life is also ending.

Every day you live,

something ends:

a thought,
a pleasure,
a fear,
a moment,
a breath.

The ending is as much life
as the beginning.

To see this
is to open the door to freedom.

“Why do we fear death so much?”

Questioner:
Even if death is natural,
the fear of it is immense.
Why?

Teacher:
Because what you call “life”
is actually the continuity
of the psychological “me.”

The “me” made of:

- memories,
- experiences,
- hurts,
- pleasures,
- ambitions,
- hopes.

It is this “me”

that is frightened of ending.

Death threatens the continuity
of everything you have gathered.

Fear exists
where there is attachment.

If you were not attached—
to your own image,
to your possessions,
to your achievements—
would you fear ending?

It is the clinging
that creates fear.

Not death.

“Is death only at the end of life?”

Questioner:
We think death happens
only when the body dies.

Teacher:
But death is happening every moment.

The moment passes—
it dies.

A thought arises and ends—
death.

A feeling comes,

moves through the body,
and ends—
death.

Life is a series of births and deaths.

To separate death
as a final event
is the invention of thought.

If you observe very closely,
you will see that death
is woven into the very fabric of living.

“But if death is always happening, why do we resist it?”

Questioner:
If every moment ends,
why don’t we accept ending easily?

Teacher:
Because psychologically
we hold on.

You never allow a thought to end.
You carry it over as memory.

You never allow hurt to end.
You store it.

You never allow pleasure to end.
You chase it in different forms.

It is the refusal to end
that creates the fear of death.

If you lived each moment fully
and let each moment end completely,
death would be as natural as sleep.

You resist death
because you resist endings.

“What does it mean to die every day?”

Questioner:
You often say
“To live is to die every day.”
What does that mean?

Teacher:
It means to die to your memories—
not the factual memories
required for daily living,
but psychological memories:

hurt,
insult,
flattery,
pleasure,
pain.

To die to yesterday
means you do not carry over
your anger of yesterday,
your attachment to yesterday,
your achievements of yesterday.

When you die inwardly
to each day,

your mind becomes fresh,
young,
innocent.

Only such a mind
can truly live.

“Can one die to attachment? To pleasure?”

Questioner:
Is it really possible, sir,
to end attachment
or pleasure
without becoming indifferent?

Teacher:
Indifference is not freedom.
Suppression is not freedom.

To die to attachment
means to understand it—
to observe its structure,
its movement.

Attachment arises
from fear and loneliness.
When fear is understood,
attachment loses its grip.

Pleasure ends
when it is observed without pursuit.

Pleasure pursued
becomes pain.

When you die to pleasure naturally—
not through will,
not through resistance—
the mind becomes astonishingly alive.

It meets life freshly
without the burden of longing.

“If we die every day, what happens to identity?”

Questioner:
If I die to everything inwardly,
what remains of “me”?

Teacher:
Why should something remain?

It is the demand for continuation
that creates the illusion of a centre.

When the centre ends—
not through effort,
not through discipline,
but through understanding its movement—
there is immense freedom.

In that freedom
a different kind of intelligence operates.

Then there is no “me”
opposed to “you.”

Life moves without conflict
when the centre is absent.

“So, living without the ‘me’ is living with death?”

Questioner:
Are you saying
that living without the self
is the same as living with death?

Teacher:
When the self is quiet,
you are living with death
and life simultaneously.

Life gives vitality,
death gives renewal.

Life gives energy,
death gives clarity.

Life is creation,
death is ending.

Where there is ending,
there is freshness.

Where there is freshness,
there is innocence.

When life and death walk together,
the mind is never old.

It is never burdened.

This is the beauty of living.

“What is the relationship between death and love?”

Questioner:
You have said
that love and death are very near.
What does that mean?

Teacher:
Love cannot exist
where the self is active.

And death—psychologically—
is the ending of the self.

Therefore, love and death
are intimately related.

To love is to die
to your own image of yourself
and of the other.

To die to possessiveness,
to jealousy,
to hurt.

Where there is love,
there is no fear of death.

Where there is fear,
love cannot be.

In love
there is renewal—
because love dies every moment
and is born every moment.

“If life and death are one, how do we live now?”

Questioner:
Then how should one live
in daily life?

Teacher:
Live with complete awareness
of the movement of the mind.

Watch attachment as it arises.
Watch fear as it arises.
Watch pleasure as it arises.

In that watching
there is an ending.

Ending of the old,
ending of the accumulated.

A mind that ends each day,
each moment,
is living with death.

And therefore
it is living with extraordinary clarity,
intelligence,
and compassion.

Only when life and death walk together
is there a mind
that is whole.

That wholeness
is the true flowering of freedom.

The hall remained silent—
not a forced silence,
but a natural stillness
born of understanding.

People sat quietly,
as though each felt
the enormous beauty
of a mind that knows
how to end.

*****

A Mind Free to Look

Sir, to look—to truly look—
is one of the most astonishing capacities of the human mind.

But very few of us ever look.

We glance,
we notice,
we recognise,
we measure,
we judge,
we compare.

But we do not look.

Because to look,
the mind must be free.

Free from its own noise,
free from memory's interference,
free from fear and desire,
free from conclusions,
free from the compulsion to change what it sees.

A mind that is not free
does not look.
It projects.

We Never Look Without the Past

When you look at a tree,
you immediately recognise it:

“Tamarind… neem… mango.”

Recognition is the movement of memory.

When you look at a friend,
you see the image
you have built about that person
over years.

When you look at your wife,
your husband,
your children—
you see through layers of memory:
hurts, expectations, disappointments, hopes.

The past looks;
the mind does not look.

As long as the past looks,
you cannot see what is.

You only see what you have known.

This is not looking;
it is the continuation of conditioning.

A Mind Burdened with Fear Cannot Look

Fear distorts perception.

If you are afraid:

- of loneliness,
- of rejection,
- of failure,
- of death,

- of losing someone—

your mind cannot look directly at the fact.

Fear pushes you to escape,
to imagine,
to hope,
to defend,
to run away.

A frightened mind
cannot look freely.

It looks through the screen of its own fears.

A Mind Driven by Desire Cannot Look

When there is desire:

- the desire for pleasure,
- the desire for security,
- the desire for recognition,
- the desire to become something—

the mind projects what it wants to see.

Desire creates an illusion
and then worships its own creation.

In desire there is no freedom;
there is only pursuit.

Where there is pursuit,
there is no looking.

A Mind Seeking a Result Cannot Look

If you look in order to:

- find an answer,
- achieve enlightenment,
- become calm,
- end your suffering,
- reach a spiritual state—

you are not looking.

You are using the present
to reach the future.

You are using observation
as a means to an end.

And a means
is never free.

A mind free to look
has no motive,
no end,
no direction.

It is simply with what is.

Freedom to Look Is Freedom from the Observer

The greatest obstacle to looking
is the observer himself:

the “me” watching,
the “me” judging,
the “me” wanting to improve,
the “me” wanting to escape.

This observer
is the past.

When the observer is active,
there is division between:

- the one who looks
- and the thing looked at.

This division creates conflict.

But when you see
that the observer is the observed—
that the anger you watch
is not separate from the "me"—
the division ends.

In this ending
there is perception.

Then the mind is free
to look.

A Free Mind Looks Without Choice

Choice exists
only when there is confusion.

If you look with a preference—

"I like this."
"I dislike that."
"This should be."
"That should not be."—

you are not looking.

You are choosing.

Choice is the denial of clarity.

A mind free to look
has no choice.

It sees.

Only sees.

Seeing itself is action.

A Free Mind Looks at Itself Without Fear

To look at oneself—
at one's motives,
desires,
ambitions,
pettiness,
jealousies,
attachments—
without defence
is the beginning of a mind that is free.

Most people are frightened
to look inwardly
because they fear what they will discover.

So, they escape.

But escape only strengthens
what is being avoided.

When you look at yourself
without the movement of fear,
without condemnation,
without justification—

you see yourself as you are.

This seeing
is the flowering of intelligence.

A Mind Free to Look Is a Mind Free from Time

When you look with the past,
your seeing is corrupted.

When you look with the future in mind—
hoping, expecting—
your seeing is diluted.

To look,
the mind must be free from psychological time:

- free from the burden of yesterday,
- free from the projection of tomorrow.

Only in the present
is there clear perception.

A mind anchored in time
cannot look freely.

A timeless mind
sees reality.

The Beauty of a Mind Free to Look

Such a mind is:

- quiet without effort,
- sensitive without sentiment,
- alert without tension,
- open without fear.

It sees things as they are:

the movement of a leaf,
the tears of a child,
the sorrow of humanity,
the beauty of a cloud,
the violence born of thought.

A mind free to look
is a mind free to love.

Because love is the purest form
of looking without the past.

Love looks
and sees
what is.

When the Mind Is Free to Look, Transformation Is Immediate

When you truly see:

- the nature of anger,
- the root of fear,
- the movement of desire,
- the pattern of escape,
- the structure of the "me,"

the very seeing
brings about a change.

Not tomorrow,
not gradually.

Immediately.

Because clarity itself
is action.

So, what is a mind free to look?

It is a mind:

- free of fear,
- free of desire,
- free of conflict,
- free of conclusion,
- free of the observer.

It is a mind that looks
without distortion,
without the shadow of the past.

Such a mind
is a light to itself.

Such a mind
lives with intelligence.

Such a mind
is the beginning of freedom.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, what does it mean to look freely?”

Questioner:
You often say,
“A mind must be free to look.”
But what does that actually mean?
I look at things every day—
at people, at nature, at myself—
but I don’t feel this freedom you speak of.

Teacher:
Madam, to look freely
is one of the most extraordinary actions of the human mind.

But most of us never look.

We recognise,
we compare,
we judge,
we evaluate,
we interpret,
we react.

All this we mistake for looking.

To look freely
is to observe without the interference
of the past.

It is to see
without the movement of the “me.”

“Do you mean that recognition prevents real looking?”

Questioner:
When I see a tree,
I recognise it—
a neem, a peepal, a banyan.
Is this recognition a problem?

Teacher:
Recognition is necessary
in daily life—
for practical functioning.

But when you look psychologically—
at yourself, at another, at the movement of your mind—
recognition becomes a barrier.

Recognition is the past.

When you recognise,
you are not seeing the fact;
you are seeing the memory.

Memory stands between you
and what actually is.

Therefore, the mind is not free.

A mind free to look
has no screen of memory.

"Is fear one of the screens?"

Questioner:
Sir, when I look at my fear,
I immediately want to avoid it,
to change it,

to get rid of it.
Does fear prevent looking?

Teacher:
Fear not only prevents looking—
it distorts perception entirely.

When you are afraid,
you do not see what is.
You see what fear projects.

Fear says:
“This must not be.”
“This is dangerous.”
“This threatens me.”

Fear interprets everything
through its own lens.

A frightened mind
cannot look freely.

To look at fear
means to observe it
without the desire to escape,
without naming it,
without judging it.

When you look at fear
without thought’s interference,
you discover
that fear loses its power.

“Desire also distorts looking, doesn’t it?”

Questioner:
When I desire something—
a relationship, success, pleasure—
my mind is completely occupied.
Is desire another barrier?

Teacher:
Desire creates its own illusion.

What you desire,
you come to see
not as it is,
but as you want it to be.

Desire colours perception.

When you desire a person,
you project qualities onto them
that may have no reality.

When you desire success,
you overlook facts
that contradict your ambition.

Desire uses looking
to fulfil itself.

Therefore, there is no freedom
in such looking.

A mind driven by desire
cannot look freely.

“What about conclusions?”

Questioner:
Sir, I have so many conclusions—
about myself,
about others,
about life.
Do these also interfere?

Teacher:
A conclusion is the death of inquiry.

When you conclude,
you stop looking.

You say:
"This is what I am."
"This is what he is."
"This is how life works."

The conclusion becomes the prison.

A mind attached to a conclusion
cannot look freely.

To look freely
is to be free from the past—
from your own knowledge,
your own certainty,
your own judgement.

In freedom
there is freshness.

The fresh mind
sees what the conditioned mind
can never see.

“Can we look at ourselves freely?”

Questioner:
When I look at myself—
my motives, my fears, my jealousy—
I immediately judge.
I say, “This is good,”
“This is bad,”
“I must change that.”
How can I look without judging?

Teacher:
Judgement is another movement of the self.

To judge is to compare what is
with what should be.

The moment you judge,
you divide the mind:

the one who judges
and the thing judged.

This division prevents clear perception.

To look freely at yourself
is to observe
without the interference of the observer.

This means:

- no condemnation,
- no justification,
- no comparison,
- no ideal.

Just look.

In that looking
there is great beauty—
because there is honesty.

And honesty is intelligence.

“Is it possible to look without the observer?”

Questioner:
I understand this intellectually,
but the “observer” is always there.
How can it disappear?

Teacher:
The observer is thought.

The observer is past experience
accumulated as memory.

The observer separates itself
from the observed
and says,
“I am watching my anger.”

But the “I” that watches
is born of the same memory
that created the anger.

So, the observer
is not separate from the anger.

When you see this fact—

not as an idea
but as truth—
the observer collapses.

Then there is only anger—
not the one who is angry.

And when there is only anger,
it can be looked at freely.

In that free looking
anger ends.

“Does motive prevent real looking?”

Questioner:
If I look in order to change myself,
in order to become free,
is that also a barrier?

Teacher:
Yes.

A motive is a projection of desire.

When you look to achieve something—
peace, clarity, enlightenment—
you are not looking at what is.

You are looking at what should be.

Motive corrupts perception.

A mind free to look
has no motive.

It looks because looking is natural—

like a flower opening to sunlight.

Such looking
has immense intelligence.

“What happens when the mind is free to look?”

Questioner:
If the mind is free—
free of fear, desire, judgement, motive—
what happens when it looks?

Teacher:
When the mind is free to look,
it sees clearly.

Clarity is action.

In that clarity
there is no conflict.

What is seen
is transformed.

If you look at fear freely,
fear dissolves.

If you look at jealousy freely,
jealousy ends.

If you look at suffering freely,
you understand its whole structure—
and in understanding,
it falls away.

A mind free to look
is a mind free to live.

The Hall Falls into Deep Stillness

Teacher spoke softly:

Sir, a mind free to look
is a mind free from the known.

It is a mind that does not carry
the burden of yesterday.

It is a mind that meets each moment
freshly.

In that freshness
there is immense beauty.

And in that beauty
there is love.

Only a mind that is free
can love.

And only a mind that loves
can look freely.

The hall remained silent—
a silence not of discipline
but of understanding.

*****

Begin to Learn Yourself

Sir, all learning begins with the world outside—
mathematics, languages, science, medicine, machines.
But the learning that transforms life,
the learning that ends conflict and sorrow,
is the learning of oneself.

And this learning
is not taught in any school,
in any book,
in any tradition.

It begins when you turn inward
and observe the movement of your own mind.

To learn yourself
is the beginning of wisdom.

Learning Yourself Is Not Accumulating Knowledge

To learn yourself
is not to gather information
about your character,
your tendencies,
your habits.

Knowledge about yourself—
even if accurate—
belongs to the past.

And the past cannot transform the present.

Learning yourself
is not a process of collecting facts.

It is the art of seeing

moment to moment
how the mind moves.

It is alive,
not mechanical.

Self-Observation Begins Now, Not in Time

You do not say:

“I will learn about myself tomorrow.”
“I will understand myself gradually.”
“I will improve slowly over the years.”

Time does not reveal the self.

Only attention does.

Self-learning is immediate.

In the very anger,
you learn about anger.
In the very fear,
you learn about fear.
In the very act of escaping,
you learn about escape.

Learning yourself
is always in the now.

You Are the Book That Must Be Read Completely

Every reaction,
every desire,
every hurt,
every fear,
every pleasure,
every belief

is a page in the book of yourself.

But you cannot read this book
with the eyes of condemnation,
with the eyes of justification,
with the eyes of comparison.

You must read it
as you would read a poem—
with openness,
with sensitivity,
without wanting to change the words.

To read yourself
is to look without choice.

Learning Yourself Requires Immense Honesty

To see oneself clearly
demands total honesty.

Not brutal honesty,
not harsh self-criticism—
but a gentle, unwavering truthfulness.

You look at your jealousy
without saying it is wrong.
You look at your ambition
without saying it is noble.
You look at your fear
without wanting to escape.

When you look honestly,
the mind becomes simple.

In simplicity
there is clarity.

To Learn Yourself, You Must See Without the Observer

Most people look at themselves
through the observer:

“I should control my anger.”
“I must get rid of fear.”
“I will become better.”

The observer is the past—
your memories,
your conditioning.

The observer divides himself
from what he observes.

This division prevents learning.

When you see anger
without the observer,
you are anger.

In that moment
anger reveals its entire structure.

And in revealing,
it begins to end.

Learning is ending.

Learning Yourself Is Not Self-Improvement

Self-improvement belongs to the realm of the self—
the very source of conflict.

When you try to become good,
try to become peaceful,
try to become compassionate,

you strengthen the “me”
that seeks satisfaction.

Self-improvement is self-expansion.

Learning yourself
is the ending of the self.

In that ending
there is freedom.

Learning Yourself Means Watching Every Movement of Thought

Thought is extraordinarily subtle.

It hides,
it disguises itself,
it pretends,
it rationalizes.

To learn yourself
is to watch thought as it arises:

- a desire to be praised,
- a fear of losing,
- a memory of pleasure,
- a hurt resurfacing,
- an image of yourself,
- a reaction to another.

Observing thought
moment to moment
is the essence of learning.

This observation
does not control thought.
It simply sees.

Seeing is enough.

Learning Yourself Requires No Method

Methods belong to time.
Methods require repetition.
Methods create a practiser
who wants an outcome.

Such a practiser
cannot learn himself.

Because learning yourself
is not a fixed path.

It is fluid,
alive,
unpredictable.

A method kills discovery.

A mind that begins to learn itself
must be free from systems.

Learning Yourself Brings Order Without Effort

Order is not imposed.
Order is not discipline.
Order is not the result of control.

Order comes naturally
when you see the disorder within you.

To see disorder—
your contradictions,
your duality,
your confusion—

is to end it.

Awareness brings order
without the movement of will.

This order
is the flowering of intelligence.

Learning Yourself Is the Beginning of Freedom

When you know the whole movement of yourself—
not intellectually,
but through direct perception—
you are no longer a prisoner
of your conditioning.

Fear begins to lose its grip.
Desire no longer dominates.
Pleasure does not become addiction.
Hurt no longer controls action.
Thought no longer creates illusions.

This freedom
is not an achievement.

It is the natural outcome
of learning.

A mind that learns itself
is a mind that is free.

And a free mind
is capable of compassion,
intelligence,
and deep love.

So, begin to learn yourself.

Not tomorrow.
Not gradually.
Not through gurus or books or systems.

Begin now—

in the very movement of this moment,
in the breath you take,
in the thought that arises,
in the feeling that passes through the heart.

This beginning
is the beginning of the ending.

And in that ending
is a mind that is new.

***

A Dialogue

"Sir, how do I begin to learn about myself?"

Questioner:
You say that the root of understanding
lies in learning about oneself.
But how does one begin?
I look at myself,
but what I see is confusing,
contradictory, fragmented.

Teacher:
Sir, learning about yourself
is the beginning of wisdom.
But learning is not analysing,
not judging,
not condemning,

not comparing.

To learn about yourself
you must observe.

Observe the movement of your thoughts
as they arise.
Observe your feelings,
your reactions,
your motives.

But observe without choosing,
without saying,
“This is good,”
“This is bad,”
“This must be changed.”

The moment you judge,
you stop learning.

“But isn’t self-analysis necessary?”

Questioner:
Psychology tells us
to analyse our thoughts,
to trace our fears to childhood,
to interpret our dreams.
Isn’t that a form of learning?

Teacher:
Analysis implies time—
tomorrow,
next week,
next year.

But learning about yourself
must happen now.

Also, in analysis
there is always:

- the analyser,
- and the thing analysed.

But the analyser is the analysed.

The "I" who examines
is itself part of the problem.

Therefore, analysis divides,
and where there is division
there is conflict.

Learning is not analysis.
Learning is direct perception.

"How can I observe myself without judgement?"

Questioner:
When I look at my jealousy,
my anger,
my vanity—
I immediately feel shame or guilt.
How can I observe without these reactions?

Teacher:
Sir, judgement is another movement of conditioning.

You have been told from childhood
"This is wrong,"
"This is right."

Your mind has accepted these values
and reacts according to them.

To observe yourself
you must put aside the judge.

The judge is the past.

When you look without the judge—
without condemnation,
without justification—
you see the fact.

And the fact itself
begins to transform.

Seeing the fact
is the beginning of freedom.

“But why is self-observation so difficult?”

Questioner:
When I try to look at myself,
my mind becomes restless.
It wanders.
It avoids.
It becomes uncomfortable.

Teacher:
Because you are not accustomed
to watching yourself honestly.

You have been trained
to look outward—
to compare,

to achieve,
to imitate,
to pursue.

You have not been trained
to look inwardly.

But the inward movement
requires sensitivity,
quietness,
alertness.

The mind escapes
because it is afraid
of what it will find.

But if you see the escape itself,
that seeing
brings clarity.

The awareness of escape
is already the beginning
of learning.

“How do I observe my thoughts as they arise?”

Questioner:
Thought moves so quickly.
I hardly see it.
How can I observe something
that comes and goes swiftly?

Teacher:
Begin with something simple.

When a thought arises—
a memory,
a fear,
a desire—
do not chase it.
Do not resist it.
Do not analyse it.

Just watch it.

Like you would watch
a leaf floating on a river.

If you watch quietly,
you will see
the beginning of thought,
the direction it takes,
the motive behind it.

This watching
without interference
is the beginning of intelligence.

“Do I watch everything—my fears, my pleasures?”

Questioner:
Should I observe everything—
my fear,
my pleasure,
my ambition,
my loneliness?

Teacher:
Yes, sir.

Everything.

Because each movement of thought
reveals a page in the book of yourself.

Fear shows how the mind escapes.
Pleasure shows how the mind clings.
Ambition shows how the mind compares.
Loneliness shows how the mind isolates itself.

You are the whole book.

You must read every page—
not with effort,
but with sensitivity.

In the reading
there is transformation.

“But won’t this become self-centred activity?”

Questioner:
If I am constantly watching myself,
won’t I become more self-absorbed?

Teacher:
On the contrary.

Self-absorption
exists only when you do not understand yourself.

When you are confused inwardly,
the self becomes a heavy burden.

But when you learn yourself,

the self begins to dissolve.

Observation reveals
the entire structure of the “me.”

And in that revelation
the “me” loses its centre.

A mind without a centre
is not self-centred.

It is free.

And only a free mind
can see clearly.

“Is self-learning a continuous process?”

Questioner:
Does this learning go on
throughout life?
Is it gradual?

Teacher:
No, sir.

Learning is always in the present.

You learn in each moment
as it unfolds.

There is no accumulation,
no storehouse of knowledge.

If you accumulate knowledge

about yourself,
that knowledge becomes the past
and interferes with observation.

You learn only
when the mind is fresh.

A fresh mind
is a free mind.

“What happens when we learn ourselves completely?”

Questioner:
Suppose one learns oneself deeply,
totally.
What happens then?

Teacher:
When you learn the whole structure
of your mind—
not through time,
but through immediate perception—
you are no longer a prisoner
of your conditioning.

Fear begins to lose its authority.
Desire no longer drives you blindly.
Pleasure does not enslave.
Hurt does not carry over.
Comparison ends.
Conflict ends.

The self—
which is the centre of sorrow—
becomes quiet.

In that quietness
there is a quality of intelligence
that is not personal.

And in that intelligence
there is freedom.

The Hall Falls into Silence

Teacher continued softly:

To begin to learn yourself
is the greatest beginning.

It is the beginning of clarity.
It is the beginning of order.
It is the beginning of love.
It is the beginning of freedom.

Without learning yourself,
all actions become confusion.
All relationships become conflict.

So, begin now—
not tomorrow,
not when it is convenient.

Begin with the breath you take,
the thought that arises,
the emotion that stirs.

Begin to learn yourself
as you would read a sacred book.

Then the mind becomes simple,
innocent,
and extraordinarily alive.

And only such a mind
can understand life.

The hall remained silent—
a silence born not of effort,
but of seeing.

*****

The Self Always Distorts

Sir, to understand the enormous significance of this statement—
“The self always distorts”—
is to understand the root of human confusion.

Because the self—
the “me,”
the centre of thought,
the bundle of memories,
experiences,
fears,
desires,
hopes,
ambitions—
is the lens through which we look at life.

And this lens
is always scratched,
coloured,
shaped by the past.

Whatever it looks at
becomes distorted.

The Self Is the Past

The self is not something mysterious.

It is:

- the memories you cherish,
- the hurts you carry,
- the pleasures you pursue,

- the images you build about yourself and others,
- the beliefs you cling to,
- the knowledge you have accumulated.

This whole movement of memory
calls itself "I."

When this past looks at the present,
it cannot see clearly.

The past casts its shadow
on everything.

A mind looking through the past
distorts the present.

The Self Distorts Relationship

When you look at another human being
through the self,
you never see the person.

You see:

- your image of them,
- your expectations of them,
- your fears,
- your attachments,
- your memories of past hurts or pleasures.

So, relationship becomes
a movement between two images—
not two human beings.

Where there are images
there is distortion.

Where there is distortion
there is conflict.

The self cannot perceive the other
as they are.

It only perceives
its own projections.

The Self Distorts Perception of Reality

Look at a tree,
a sunset,
a mountain.

If the self is active—
naming,
comparing,
recalling past pleasures,
desiring continuity—

you do not see the thing itself.

You see the thought around it.

Thought stands between you
and the real.

The self places a veil
between the mind
and the fact.

Only a mind without the self
sees what is true.

The Self Distorts Action

All action born of the self
is limited
because it arises from:

- fear,
- desire,
- ambition,
- hurt,
- comparison,
- the urge to become.

Such action
inevitably leads to contradiction.

The self acts to protect itself,
and in protecting itself
creates division.

Division is distortion.

From this division
come conflict,
violence,
jealousy,
competition,
sorrow.

Action born of the self
is never whole.

The Self Distorts Learning

When you look at yourself

with a motive:

“I must change.”
“I must become better.”
“I must get rid of my flaws.”

the self immediately interferes.

It wants a result.
It wants achievement.
It wants improvement.

This wanting
distorts seeing.

True learning
occurs only when the mind is free:

- free of the judge,
- free of the analyser,
- free of the image of what it should be.

Learning requires a mind
that sees without distortion.

The Self Distorts Love

The self cannot love.

What we call love
is usually possession,
dependency,
fear of loneliness,
comfort-seeking.

Where the self is,

there is attachment.

Attachment is not love.

Attachment is rooted in fear.

Fear distorts.

Therefore, where the self operates,
love cannot flower.

Love exists only
when the self is absent.

The Self Distorts Freedom

We think freedom means
the ability to do what we want.

But the “want”
belongs to the self.

The self’s desires
are conditioned—
shaped by culture, fear, experience.

A mind following desire
is not free.

It is enslaved
by its own conditioning.

Freedom begins
when the self ends.

Only then
does the mind perceive
without distortion.

The Self Distorts Meditation

Meditation becomes distortion
when the self seeks:

- silence,
- enlightenment,
- spiritual power,
- mystical experiences,
- escape from suffering.

Such meditation
is merely the self expanding its territory.

Meditation has meaning
only when the self
is completely absent.

In that absence
there is clarity,
stillness,
compassion.

The Self Distorts Truth

Truth is not something
to be sought or found.

Truth is to be seen.

But the observer
is never free from the known.

The self looks for truth
through its own conditioning.

Therefore, the very search
becomes distortion.

Only when the self
is utterly quiet
does truth reveal itself.

And truth is never personal.

To See That the Self Distorts

Is the Beginning of Intelligence

The moment you see—
with your whole being—
that the self distorts everything:

your perception,
your relationships,
your actions,
your meditation,
your search—

that very seeing
is the beginning of intelligence.

And intelligence
acts without distortion.

Intelligence is not yours or mine.
It does not belong to the self.

It comes into being
when the self is not.

So, the self always distorts—what does this mean for daily life?

It means:

- look without the past,
- listen without judgement,
- meet people without images,
- observe yourself without the observer,
- act without seeking reward,
- live without becoming.

When the self is absent,
there is clarity.

Where there is clarity,
there is compassion.

Where there is compassion,
there is no distortion.

In such a mind,
truth flowers.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, why do you say the self always distorts?”

Questioner:
You say often that the self—this “me,”
this centre of thought and memory—

always distorts.
I don't fully understand what you mean.
How does the self distort anything?

Teacher:
Sir, the self is the past.
The self is the accumulation
of memories, experiences, hurts, pleasures, beliefs.

When such a mind looks at the present,
it looks through the screen of the past.

Therefore, what it sees
is not the fact—
but its own projection.

So naturally,
the self must distort.

It cannot see clearly
because clarity requires freedom
from the past.

"Are you saying we never see anything as it is?"

Questioner:
Do you mean that whatever I look at—
a person, a situation, myself—
is always coloured by the past?

Teacher:
If you notice carefully,
you will see that you never meet anything freshly.

When you look at your wife or husband,

you look through years of images—
of pleasure,
of hurt,
of disappointment,
of expectation.

You are meeting not the person,
but the image you have built.

Likewise,
when you look at yourself,
you look through your own conclusions:

“I am this,”
“I am that,”
“I must become better.”

All this prevents direct perception.

So, you never see “what is”;
you see “what has been.”

That is distortion.

“Does fear distort perception as well?”

Questioner:
When I am afraid,
I feel my mind cannot see clearly.
Is that also the self distorting?

Teacher:
Fear is one of the strongest expressions of the self.

Fear says:

“This should not happen.”
“I must protect myself.”
“I must escape.”

So, fear projects its own images—
of danger, of loss, of insecurity.

A frightened mind
cannot see the fact.

It sees what it fears.

Fear interprets reality
in its own terms.

Therefore, fear distorts.

“What about desire? Does it distort too?”

Questioner:
When I desire something intensely—
success, recognition, pleasure—
I feel I don’t see things accurately.
Is desire also part of this distortion?

Teacher:
Of course.

Desire shapes perception
to serve its own purpose.

When you desire success,
you overlook obstacles.
When you desire pleasure,
you ignore consequences.

When you desire a person,
you project qualities onto them
that they may not actually have.

Desire creates an image
and then chases the image.

This movement
is distortion.

“Is the self behind all this distortion?”

Questioner:
So, fear, desire, memory, hurt—
are these all expressions of the self?

Teacher:
Yes.

The self is not something mystical.
It is very simple.

The self is:

- The centre that says “I want,”
- The centre that says “I must have,”
- The centre that says “I am hurt,”
- The centre that says “I am important,”
- The centre that compares, judges, and condemns.

This centre
is inherently divisive.

And where there is division,
there must be distortion.

“Can the self look at anything without distorting it?”

Questioner:
Can the self ever observe without distortion?
Is it possible for the self to look clearly?

Teacher:
The self cannot look clearly.

Please see this.

The self is distortion.

The moment the “me” looks,
it looks through the lens of its own conditioning.

Clear perception
comes only when the “me”
is utterly quiet.

Not suppressed,
not controlled,
not disciplined,
but naturally quiet
because the mind sees the danger
of distortion.

When there is danger,
you act instantly.

Similarly,
when you see the enormous danger
of looking through the self,
the self naturally becomes quiet.

Then the mind looks without distortion.

“How do we see that danger?”

Questioner:
Sir, I hear your words,
but how do I actually see
that the self is dangerous?

Teacher:
Look at your life.

Where there is the self,
there is conflict.

In relationship,
the self wants appreciation,
security,
certainty,
and so, it creates hurt, dependence, jealousy.

In ambition,
the self competes and breeds anxiety.

In fear,
the self protects its own image.

In pleasure,
it becomes addicted.

Everywhere the self operates,
there is disorder.

If you see this as fact—
as you see a snake is dangerous—

you act instantly.

Seeing the truth
ends distortion.

“Does the self distort even meditation?”

Questioner:
Many of us meditate.
Does the self distort meditation too?

Teacher:
When the self meditates,
it is merely seeking experience.

It wants peace,
or enlightenment,
or visions,
or escape from pain.

This seeking
is desire.

Desire distorts.

Therefore, meditation becomes
a continuation of the self—
not the ending of it.

True meditation
is the complete absence of the self.

Only then
is there clarity.

“If the self is always distorting, how does clarity happen?”

Questioner:
If the self is always active,
always interfering,
how can clarity ever be?

Teacher:
Clarity does not come through effort.

Clarity comes through seeing.

When you see,
with total attention,
that the self distorts everything,
that seeing is instantaneous.

You cannot struggle your way
into clarity.

But when the mind sees the truth
of the self’s activity,
there is a profound quietness.

In that quietness
the self does not operate.

In that quietness
there is clarity.

Clarity is not an achievement;
it is the absence of distortion.

The Hall Falls into Stillness

Teacher spoke again, softly:

Sir, the self always distorts
because the self is born of the past.

It is the past looking at the present.

But life is always new.

To meet life with the old
is distortion.

To see without the old—
without fear,
without desire,
without image—
is to see clearly.

A mind that sees clearly
acts rightly.

And a mind that acts rightly
is a mind without sorrow.

To understand the self
is to end distortion.

To end distortion
is to be free.

The hall remained quiet—
a silence that held
the fragrance of insight.

*****

Be Just with the Living

There is a strange contradiction in the human mind: it seeks the sacred while neglecting the immediate. One may speak eloquently of God, of service, of charity, of noble causes, yet in daily life remain careless, unjust, or indifferent toward the people with whom one is directly related. This contradiction is not accidental; it is created by thought as an escape from facing what is.

It is far easier to give money to a temple, a church, a cause, or an abstract idea called "humanity" than to meet one's responsibility toward a living human being. A symbol does not demand clarity. An institution does not question our honesty. But a person—someone to whom we owe money, care, attention, or truth—brings us face to face with ourselves. And that encounter is uncomfortable.

So thought invents a division: here is the "spiritual" life, and there is the "worldly" life. In the spiritual life, one gives, prays, donates, feels virtuous. In the worldly life, one postpones responsibility, delays repayment, justifies negligence, and hopes that generosity elsewhere will compensate for disorder here. This division is false.

If there is disorder in relationship, no amount of charity can make life sacred.

The idea that one can be unjust in daily conduct and yet religious in intention is one of the greatest deceptions encouraged by society. Religion then becomes a means of self-absolution. One gives not out of clarity, but out of guilt, fear, or the desire to feel good about oneself. Such giving is not generosity; it is psychological bargaining.

Who are the so-called "living gods"?

They are the people we meet every day—the worker, the lender, the colleague, the family member, the one who depends on our word. In relationship with them, life reveals its truth. If we evade responsibility there, we are evading life itself.

To be just with the living does not require belief, ritual, or ideology. It requires attention. Attention to what one has promised. Attention to the impact of one's actions. Attention to the fact that postponement, excuse, and clever reasoning are forms of violence.

When there is attention, order comes naturally. One does not need to be told to be honest or responsible. And when there is order, generosity has a completely different quality. Then giving is not an act of virtue or sacrifice; it is a natural movement of care. It is not calculated, nor motivated by reward—divine or social.

So, the question is not whether one should give to God or to noble causes. The question is: is there order in one's life?
Is one's relationship with money, with people, with promises, clear and simple?

Without that clarity, all offerings are empty gestures. With that clarity, even the smallest act becomes sacred.

To set one's house in order is not preparation for spirituality—it is spirituality.
And only in that order can there be compassion that is not divided between the ideal and the actual.

*****

Justice in the World of Illusion

We talk endlessly about justice—social justice, legal justice, economic justice—as though justice were an independent force waiting to be perfected. We assume that if laws were better written, courts more efficient, and institutions less corrupt, justice would finally prevail. But is justice merely a matter of better organisation? Or is justice, as we know it, bound to the same illusion that governs our lives?

The world we live in is a world of division. There is the rich and the poor, the powerful and the powerless, the successful and the failed, the believer and the non-believer, the citizen and the outsider. These divisions are not accidental. They are created by thought—by comparison, measurement, ambition, fear, and the desire for security. From this fragmented consciousness arises society, and from society arise its laws.

Justice, therefore, is not separate from consciousness. It is its reflection.

In a world built on illusion, justice cannot be whole. It can only be partial, conditional, and negotiated. It may restrain excess, regulate behaviour, and impose order, but it cannot touch the root of injustice. For the root lies not in institutions, but in the human mind.

Justice in such a world becomes procedural. It asks not what is true, but what is provable. It asks not what is right, but what is permissible. It moves slowly, weighed down by precedent, delay, influence, and cost. Time itself becomes a form of inequality: for the powerful, delay is tolerable; for the powerless, it is devastating.

Thus, justice appears blind, yet sees clearly where money and power reside.

We may condemn corruption, but corruption is not an aberration—it is the natural outcome of a society that worships success and authority. Where power is admired, justice will serve power. Where wealth is envied, justice will protect wealth. This is not cynicism; it is observation.

The deeper illusion is the belief that justice can exist independently of the consciousness that produces injustice.

We want justice without questioning ambition.
We want equality without ending comparison.
We want fairness without relinquishing privilege.

So, we reform laws, change governments, write new constitutions—and repeat the same patterns. The surface changes, but the structure remains intact, because the mind that creates it has not changed.

Law, by its nature, belongs to the past. It is based on memory, precedent, and accumulated knowledge. It can punish an act after it has occurred, but it cannot prevent the psychological movement that gives rise to the act. It can manage conflict, but it cannot end it.

Justice, when reduced to law, becomes a mechanism—not an expression of intelligence.

True justice would require a radical transformation: the ending of the psychological centre that seeks advantage, security, and superiority. A mind that does not divide itself as "me" and "you," "us" and "them," cannot act unjustly. Such

a mind does not need enforcement; its action is naturally right.

But this kind of justice cannot be legislated. It cannot be institutionalised. It cannot be taught as a system or imposed as an ideology. The moment it is organised, it becomes another form of control—and therefore another expression of illusion.

This does not mean that laws are unnecessary. In a confused world, they may be essential to prevent chaos. But to mistake law for justice is a profound error. Order imposed by authority is not the same as order born of intelligence.

As long as the world remains inwardly divided, justice will remain outwardly fragmented. It will sometimes be humane, often harsh, always limited. It will continue to belong to the world of illusion.

So, the real inquiry is not how to perfect justice, but whether the mind can end the illusion that sustains injustice.

When illusion ends, justice is no longer a concept, a demand, or a system. It becomes a way of living—silent, uncompromising, and whole.

***

Compassion and Law

Law is written in words.
Compassion has no language.

Law measures, classifies, judges.
Compassion listens.

Law asks, who is right?
Compassion asks nothing
and therefore understands.

Law must follow precedent,
procedure, permission.
Compassion moves
before thought arrives.

Law protects order.
Compassion questions the order
that produces suffering.

Law can punish the act.
Compassion sees the whole movement
that gave birth to it.

Law belongs to society,
to time, to authority.
Compassion belongs to no one.
It arises when the self is absent.

Law needs enforcement.
Compassion needs no command.

Where law ends,
violence often begins.
Where compassion is,
violence has no place to root.

A society can survive without compassion
and still call itself civilised.
But without compassion,
law becomes a refined instrument of cruelty.

Compassion does not oppose law.
It stands outside it.
And from that distance,
it reveals the poverty of order
without love.

When the mind is free of fear,
free of ambition,
free of becoming—
compassion acts.

And in that action,
no law is broken,
yet no injustice remains hidden.

*****

Attachment and flowering of goodness

When one faces the actuality of attachment, it is not an idea, not a theory, not something to be judged or explained away. It is a fact. One sees oneself attached—to a person, to a belief, to an image, to an experience. In that seeing, one may not immediately perceive all its consequences, all its subtle implications, all the conflicts and fears it breeds. But the fact itself is there, naked and undeniable.

To face a fact does not require analysis; it requires attention.

Attachment is not merely clinging; it is dependence. It is the mind seeking continuity, security, permanence in something that is by nature impermanent. And from this dependence arise fear of loss, jealousy, possessiveness, sorrow. These are not separate from attachment; they are contained within it. But the mind rarely sees this whole movement at once. It prefers to deal in fragments—this attachment is acceptable, that one is not; this is love, that is weakness.

Now, when we speak of goodness, the mind immediately moves into another field altogether. Each of us carries opinions about what it means to be good—shaped by culture, religion, education, tradition, and personal experience. One person calls obedience goodness; another calls rebellion goodness. One says sacrifice is good; another says self-fulfilment is good. Thus, goodness becomes a matter of comparison, measurement, and conclusion.

But can goodness ever be a conclusion?

If goodness is based on values, and values differ from person to person, society to society, then goodness is relative. And what is relative is always in conflict. What is good for one

becomes evil for another. So, the question arises: is goodness something that thought can formulate, define, or practise? Or does goodness come into being only when the mind is free from the very movement that seeks to define it?

Attachment seeks security; goodness has no motive.
Attachment is born of fear; goodness is without fear.
Attachment depends; goodness is complete in itself.

One cannot become good, just as one cannot practise freedom. The very effort to be good is already the activity of the self-seeking respectability, reward, or salvation. Where there is attachment to an image of oneself as good, goodness is absent.

So, the inquiry is not, how shall I be good? but rather, Can the mind see attachment as it is, without choice, without condemnation, without justification? In that direct perception, something extraordinary happens: the mind is no longer occupied with becoming. And it is in that state of non-becoming that goodness flowers—effortlessly, silently, without name.

Goodness is not the opposite of attachment; it is the ending of attachment through understanding. And that understanding is not cumulative; it is instantaneous, or it is not understanding at all.

***

Question:
When one faces the actuality of attachment, it is a fact. One may not see all its consequences, all the implications involved in it. But when we talk about goodness—what it is to be good—there seem to be endless opinions, values, and conclusions. Why is there such confusion?

Answer:

Because attachment is something you can observe directly, whereas goodness is usually something we think about. Attachment is a fact of relationship. It is there in daily living—in fear, in dependence, in the demand for security. But goodness has been turned into an idea, a principle, a moral achievement.

Question:
Are you saying that attachment is easier to see than goodness?

Answer:
Not easier—more immediate. You can feel attachment when it is threatened. When the person you depend on withdraws, when an image you cherish is questioned, when security is shaken, attachment reveals itself instantly. There is no philosophy involved then. There is pain, fear, anxiety. That is a fact.

Question:
But we often justify attachment by calling it love, duty, or responsibility.

Answer:
Of course. Thought is very clever. It gives noble names to its own fears. When attachment is pleasant, we call it love. When it hurts, we call it suffering. But the root remains the same—dependence for psychological security.

Question:
Is attachment always wrong?

Answer:
See how quickly the mind wants to judge. The question is not whether attachment is right or wrong, but whether you can see it as it is, without choosing, without condemning, without justifying. The moment you judge, you have moved away from the fact.

Question:
If one merely observes attachment, what happens then?

Answer:
If observation is complete—without the observer interfering—then the whole movement of attachment is revealed: its fears, its demands, its possessiveness, its inevitable sorrow. Not as a sequence over time, but as a single movement.

Question:
But we rarely see the whole, don't we? We see fragments.

Answer:
Yes, because the mind itself is fragmented. It wants pleasure without pain, security without fear, attachment without loss. So, it divides. And in that division, it never sees the totality.

Question:
How does this relate to goodness?

Answer:
We bring the same fragmented mind to the question of goodness. One person says goodness is obedience; another says it is rebellion. One calls sacrifice goodness; another calls enjoyment goodness. Each conclusion is shaped by conditioning.

Question:
So, goodness becomes relative.

Answer:
Exactly. And what is relative breeds conflict. Your goodness becomes my violence. Your virtue becomes my corruption. Society then codifies this confusion into laws, religions, and moral systems.

Question:
Are you suggesting that goodness has nothing to do with values?

Answer:
Values are put together by thought. They are measurements—better, worse, higher, lower. Goodness cannot be measured. The moment you measure it, it ceases to be goodness.

Question:
Then how does one come upon goodness?

Answer:
You don't come upon it. You don't seek it. You don't practise it. Goodness is not the result of effort.

Question:
That sounds strange. We are taught that goodness requires discipline and effort.

Answer:
Effort implies resistance, conflict, becoming something you are not. That is the activity of the self. Where the self is striving to be good, goodness is absent.

Question:
Then is goodness the opposite of attachment?

Answer:
No. Opposites belong to thought. Goodness is not the opposite of attachment, just as light is not the opposite of darkness. Light ends darkness; it does not oppose it.

Question:
So, when attachment ends, goodness begins?

Answer:

Be careful. If you say, “First I must end attachment, then I will be good,” you have turned it into a process in time. That again is thought projecting an ideal.

Question:
Then what is the right approach?

Answer:
There is no approach. There is only seeing. When attachment is seen completely, without escape, without naming, without judgement, it ends. Not tomorrow, not gradually, but instantly.

Question:
And goodness?

Answer:
When the mind is no longer occupied with becoming, with securing itself, with defending its images, there is a natural state of order. That order is goodness.

Question:
So, goodness is not cultivated?

Answer:
No. It flowers when the soil is right. And the soil is right when there is freedom from fear, freedom from attachment, freedom from the self’s endless demands.

Question:
Is such freedom possible in daily life?

Answer:
If it were not, we wouldn’t be talking about it. It is possible only when one stops asking how and begins to observe. Not tomorrow, not as an ideal, but now—in relationship, in speech, in silence.

Question:
Then goodness has no name, no form?

Answer:
The moment you name it, you lose it. Like love, like beauty, like truth—it exists only when the mind is utterly quiet. And that quietness is not achieved; it comes when the mind understands itself completely.

Question:
So, the ending of attachment is the beginning of goodness?

Answer:
Not the beginning—there is no beginning or ending. There is only what is. When what is is seen without distortion, goodness is.

***

- What is seen directly needs no belief.
- Where observation begins, opinion ends.
- A mind that looks without choice is already free of authority.
- Goodness is not cultivated; it flowers when the self is absent.
- What ends through understanding leaves no residue.
- Freedom is not a reward; it is the ending of fear.
- When there is no becoming, there is order—and that order is goodness.

*****

To Raise or To Free

Man says, “Because I have given birth to children, it is my responsibility to bring them up.” On the surface, this appears reasonable, even noble. But hidden within this statement is something far more complex and dangerous. Responsibility is often used as a justification for ambition, competition, and domination.

To “bring them up” quickly becomes to secure their future, to ensure their success, to make them superior to others. And in doing so, man treads over others—consciously or unconsciously—competing, accumulating, pushing, justifying cruelty in the name of care.

Is this responsibility, or is it fear?

Fear of insecurity, fear of poverty, fear of being nobody, fear that my children may fall behind in the brutal race society has created. That fear is then clothed in respectable words—duty, protection, love. Society applauds this behaviour, calls it moral, calls it natural. But is it?

If one observes carefully, one sees that this so-called responsibility is an extension of the self. My children, my family, my future. The children become a continuation of one’s own ambition; one’s own unfulfilled desires; one’s own hunger for status and permanence. And because the self is competitive, divisive, and fearful, it inevitably creates a world of violence—subtle or gross.

Can there be responsibility without possessiveness?
Can there be care without comparison?
Can there be love without fear?

True responsibility does not arise from biology or social convention. Giving birth does not confer wisdom. Responsibility is not to prepare a child to succeed in a corrupt society, but to question the very nature of that society.

To be responsible is not to teach the child how to dominate, compete, or conform, but to help the child understand fear, desire, and the movement of thought itself. That demands that the parent first understand these movements within himself.

One who is inwardly violent cannot raise a non-violent child.
One who lives in fear cannot teach freedom.
One who pursues success cannot teach goodness.

So, the real question is not, "How shall I bring up my children?" but "What am I?" For the child will learn not from your words, but from your life.

Responsibility, when rooted in the self, becomes cruelty.
Responsibility, when born of understanding, becomes compassion.

And compassion never treads over another—for it has no centre from which to dominate.

*****

Can violence heal society?

Can you correct society through violence?
Can disorder be ended by organised disorder?

Society is not something separate from us; it is the outward expression of our inward state. When the mind is violent—aggressive, competitive, fearful—that violence inevitably shapes the structure we call society. To attack society through violence is therefore to attack ourselves without understanding ourselves.

It is like cutting away diseased tissue again and again without ever understanding the disease. The knife may remove what is visible, but the cause remains untouched. The disease simply reappears in another form, perhaps more subtle, perhaps more dangerous.

Revolutions, whether political, religious, or ideological, promise renewal through destruction. They remove one set of rulers, one set of symbols, one set of laws—but the mind that created oppression remains unchanged. So, oppression returns, wearing a different name, speaking a different language.

Violence can change form, but it cannot change awareness.
Force can impose order, but it cannot bring understanding.

The moment you use violence to correct society; you accept violence as a legitimate instrument. And what you legitimise, you perpetuate. Violence then becomes tradition, policy, necessity—respected and defended.

The real question is not how to correct society, but whether the mind that seeks correction understands its own disorder. Without that understanding, every reform is merely cosmetic, every revolution a rearrangement of the same decay.

A surgeon does not operate blindly. He studies the body, understands the pathology, observes the whole organism. To cut without understanding is to kill the patient. Similarly, to act upon society without understanding the psychological disease—fear, greed, ambition, division—is to destroy without healing.

So, the inquiry turns inward, not as escape, but as responsibility. Can one end violence in oneself—not as an idea, not as an ideal, but as a living fact? In that ending, a different kind of action comes into being—action that is not reaction, not reform, not revolution.

Only such action has intelligence.

And intelligence alone can heal—whether in the body or in society.

*****

There Is No Distraction

Sir, we often complain:
“I am distracted.”
“My mind wanders.”
“I lose focus.”
“I cannot stay with what I am observing.”

But if you watch very carefully,
you will see a profound truth:

There is no such thing as distraction.

There is only movement of thought
according to its conditioning.

What we call “distraction”
is simply thought moving
to something it finds more pleasurable,
more interesting,
more comforting,
or more fearful.

The mind is never distracted;
it merely follows
what it values at that moment.

Distraction Exists Only When You Want to Control the Mind

You say you are distracted
only when you have decided
what the mind should pay attention to.

You create the ideal—
“This is important,”
“This is spiritual,”
“This must be observed”—
and then when the mind moves elsewhere,
you call it distraction.

But the mind is just doing
what it has always done:
moving.

It is the conflict
between “what is”
and “what should be”
that creates the illusion
of distraction.

Without the ideal,
there is no distraction.

The Mind Moves According to Its Conditioning

Thought wanders
because it is conditioned to wander.

It seeks pleasure,
avoids pain,
moves toward the familiar,
escapes the uncomfortable.

This movement is not distraction;
it is conditioning operating.

If you watch without judgment,
you will see that thought

goes exactly where it has been trained to go.

The movement itself
is the reality.

Calling it “distraction”
is merely labelling,
condemning,
resisting—

which prevents understanding.

What You Call Distraction Is the State of Your Mind

When you say,
“I am distracted,”
you reveal not a problem
but a fact:

The mind is restless,
scattered,
fragmented.

That restlessness
is the very content of the mind.

To observe it
is to learn.

To resist it
is to strengthen it.

The so-called distraction
is exactly what the mind is.

To see this fact
without resistance
is the beginning of understanding.

Distraction Exists Only When There Is Division

Distraction exists
only when you divide your attention:

“This is what I want to focus on,”
but the mind moves elsewhere.

The division between:

- the observer
  and
- the movement of thought

creates the struggle.

But the observer
is the thought.

The one who says
“I am distracted”
is simply another fragment
of the same movement.

When you see the fact
that the observer and the distracted thought
are both part of one single movement,
the division ends.

And with the ending of division
comes the ending of distraction.

Total Attention Has No Distraction

When there is complete, choiceless attention,
there is only observation—
not the desire to observe something specific.

Attention is without motive,
without direction.

In such attention,
whatever arises
is part of the observation.

A sound,
a sensation,
a thought,
a memory—

all of it
is included.

Nothing is a distraction
because nothing is separate.

In total attention,
distraction has no meaning.

Trying to Control Distraction Is Another Form of Distraction

The effort to control the mind—
to force it to concentrate,
to make it silent—
is itself a distraction.

Because now the mind is occupied with:

"I must not think this."
"I must stay focused."
"I must meditate properly."
"I must be quiet."

The controller
is the controlled.

Trying to overcome distraction
is still part of the same disorder.

Understanding the movement
brings freedom.

Control brings conflict.

See the Movement of Thought Without Resistance

If you simply watch the movement of thought—
its restlessness,
its associations,
its escapes,
its desires—
without saying
"This is distraction"
or
"I must be attentive,"

you will discover
a very quiet, natural attention emerging.

Attention comes
when you stop trying.

The so-called distraction
becomes the object of study—
and therefore, it becomes learning,
not interference.

In that learning
there is order.

When You Understand Distraction, the Mind Becomes Still

Stillness is not achieved
by battling distraction.

Stillness comes
when there is complete understanding
of the movement of thought.

When you see:

- why thought wanders,
- what it seeks,
- what it avoids,
- how it escapes,
- how it clings,
- how it repeats,

this very seeing
brings about a quietness
that is not manufactured.

A mind that understands itself
has no distraction
because it has no division.

Such a mind
is extraordinarily alive,
sensitive,
and clear.

So, there is no distraction. What does this mean?

It means:

- the mind always moves according to conditioning;
- recognising this movement as "distraction" is an escape;
- the label prevents learning;
- the so-called distraction is actually the fact;
- observing the fact without judgment is attention;
- attention has no distraction.

Where there is complete attention,
there is wholeness.

And in wholeness,
the idea of distraction
simply does not exist.

***

A Dialogue

"Sir, my mind is always distracted."

Questioner:
Sir, my mind wanders constantly.
During meditation, while studying, even in conversation—
I find myself drifting away.
I am restless, unable to focus.
Why does the mind get so distracted?
How can one be attentive?

Teacher:
Sir, let us look at this word "distraction."
When you say the mind is distracted,
you mean that it has moved away
from something you think
it should pay attention to.

But is that movement
really a distraction?

Or is it simply
the natural movement of thought?

Thought moves—
that is its nature.
It associates, compares, escapes, pursues.
This movement you call "distraction."

But if there were no fixed point
from which you demanded attention,
would there be distraction?

"Are you saying distraction is an illusion?"

Questioner:
Are you suggesting that distraction
is not real?
It certainly feels real.

Teacher:
It feels real
because you have an ideal
of what attention should be.

You decide:
“I must concentrate on this.”
Then thought moves elsewhere—
to a memory, a sensation, another sound—
and you call that movement “distraction.”

But the movement of thought
is simply what the mind is doing.

It is not distraction—
it is conditioning.

You have trained the mind
to pursue pleasure,
to avoid pain,
to seek comfort,
to escape discomfort.

This conditioning is moving.
And you label its movement
as distraction.

But the movement itself
is what the mind actually is.

“But I want to focus on something important.”

Questioner:
Sir, when I am reading something important,
or listening to someone,
the mind wanders.
Isn’t that distraction?

Teacher:
Not at all.

It only shows
that the mind does not find
what you call “important”
as important as you think it should.

Thought moves
towards what it finds pleasurable,
towards what it fears,
towards what it has been conditioned to value.

The so-called “important thing”
may not hold its interest—
not because it is unimportant,
but because the mind is conditioned
to follow stimulation,
not seriousness.

The movement is not distraction;
it is revelation.

It reveals the actual nature
of the mind.

“So, distraction is a symptom, not a problem?”

Questioner:
Then distraction is not the problem—
but shows what the mind is?

Teacher:
Exactly.

The so-called distraction
is the fact.

It is telling you:
“This is what the mind actually is—
restless, scattered, fragmented.”

If you fight the distraction,
you fight the fact.

When you push away the fact,
you cannot learn from it.

But if you look at the mind’s movement
without judgement—
without saying “I must control this”—
then you begin to learn.

And in learning,
there is order.

Order is not discipline;
it is understanding.

“Why does the mind wander at all?”

Questioner:
Why does thought wander so much?
Why does it not remain attentive?

Teacher:
Because the mind has never been taught
to look at itself.

It has been trained to compare,
to remember,
to pursue success,

to avoid fear,
to seek pleasure.

This constant movement
is its habit.

When you impose the idea
of "focus"
onto this conditioned structure,
you create conflict.

But if you observe the movement
as it is—
its wandering,
its slackness,
its fears,
its escapes—
then you begin to understand the mind.

Observation brings intelligence.
Intelligence brings natural attention.

"Is attention the opposite of distraction?"

Questioner:
Then what is attention?
Is it the opposite of distraction?

Teacher:
Attention has no opposite.

Opposites exist only
when there is conflict.

Attention is not concentration.

Concentration implies resistance,
exclusion of everything
except a chosen fragment.

Attention includes everything.

In attention,
you hear the bird,
you feel your own breath,
you notice thought moving—
and nothing is excluded.

Everything is part of the observation.

In such attention,
distraction has no meaning.

Because there is no division.

“But can one sustain attention?”

Questioner:
I experience moments of attention—
but they don’t last.
How can I maintain them?

Teacher:
Sir, anything you maintain
is not attention.

It becomes effort,
control,
discipline.

Attention comes naturally

when the mind sees something clearly.

Have you noticed—
when there is danger,
your attention is total?

No effort,
no practice,
no method.

The very perception
brings attention.

Similarly,
if you see the truth
that distraction does not exist—
that the mind's wandering
is simply what it is—
this very seeing
brings a natural stillness.

Attention is the outcome
of understanding.

Not the result of discipline.

"How do I observe thought without interference?"

Questioner:
When a thought arises,
I immediately feel like
following it
or resisting it.
How can I watch thought
without interfering?

Teacher:
Observe the impulse itself.

“I want to follow.”
“I want to resist.”

These are thoughts too.

Do not separate yourself
from these movements.

The observer
is not separate
from the observed.

When you see
that the observer is part of thought,
that division ends.

In the absence of division,
observation becomes complete.

And in complete observation,
there is attention.

“What happens when there is total attention?”

Questioner:
If there is attention without distraction,
what happens in the mind?

Teacher:
The mind becomes extraordinarily still.

Not still through suppression
or force,
but still because
it has understood itself.

A quiet mind
is not a disciplined mind.
It is a mind
that is free from conflict.

In that stillness,
there is clarity.
There is insight.
There is intelligence.

Such a mind
sees things as they are.

And such seeing
is action.

A Deep Silence in the Hall

Teacher spoke softly:

Sir, there is no distraction.
There is only the movement of thought
according to its conditioning.

When you understand this movement
without resistance,
without judgement,
without the desire to control—
attention flowers.

And when there is attention,
there is love.

Love is not distracted.
Love is not fragmented.
Love is whole.

A mind that sees the truth
that distraction does not exist
is a mind
that is free.

The silence deepened—
a silence that carried
the fragrance of understanding.

*****

Seeking Pleasure

Sir, the movement of human consciousness—
from ancient times until this very moment—
is largely the movement of seeking pleasure.

Pleasure has become the guiding principle
of our thoughts,
our actions,
our relationships,
our ambitions,
our beliefs.

We build our lives around it—
and suffer endlessly because of it.

So let us go into this carefully,
quietly,
as one would examine a delicate flower.

Pleasure Begins as Sensation

Pleasure always begins with sensation.

You see a beautiful sunset,
you taste a delicious meal,
you hear a word of praise,
you experience a moment of affection.

In that moment,
there is no problem.

Sensation is natural,
simple,

innocent.

But thought picks up that sensation
and begins to pursue it.

Thought Makes Memory into Pleasure

Thought says:
"That felt so good—let me have it again."

Thought takes the living moment,
turns it into memory,
and then desires the repetition.

Pleasure is created
when thought clings to memory.

The repeated demand for that memory
breeds the whole machinery of pursuit.

The Pursuit of Pleasure Is Endless

Every pleasure stimulates
a desire for more:

More excitement,
more thrill,
more recognition,
more comfort,
more stimulation.

Pleasure breeds habit,
and habit breeds dependence.

The mind becomes trapped

in a cycle:

experience → memory → desire → pursuit →
disappointment → renewed desire

This is the machinery of pleasure.

Pleasure Always Brings Fear

Where there is pleasure,
there is fear.

- Fear of losing what you enjoy,
- Fear that it will change,
- Fear that someone might take it away,
- Fear that it might not return.

Pleasure and fear
are two sides of the same coin.

You cannot hold pleasure
without holding fear.

Therefore, the pursuit of pleasure
is the pursuit of fear.

Pleasure Distorts Relationship

In relationship,
pleasure expresses itself as:

- possession,
- dependency,
- attachment,
- jealousy.

You enjoy another's affection,

their companionship,
their attention—
and thought converts it into pleasure.

Then you want it repeated.
Then you want it permanent.

The moment you want permanence,
fear begins.

Fear of loss,
fear of betrayal,
fear of loneliness.

Where there is fear,
love cannot be.

Pleasure destroys love.

Pleasure Is Not Joy

Pleasure is of the mind.
Joy is of the heart.

Pleasure depends on memory.
Joy is immediate.

Pleasure seeks repetition.
Joy never seeks continuation.

Pleasure is born of thought.
Joy is born of attention.

Where there is the pursuit of pleasure,
joy cannot flower.

The Mind Becomes a Slave to Stimulation

Modern life intensifies pleasure:

- through entertainment,
- through sexuality,
- through sensation,
- through technology,
- through comparison,
- through ambition.

The mind becomes dull
because it constantly seeks stimulation.

A mind that depends on stimulation
becomes restless,
empty,
mechanical.

In seeking pleasure,
the mind loses sensitivity.

Seeking Pleasure Prevents Understanding

When you seek pleasure:

- you avoid facing fear,
- you avoid looking at yourself,
- you avoid confronting loneliness,
- you avoid understanding sorrow.

Pleasure becomes the drug
that masks the real problems of living.

As long as pleasure is the motive,
there can be no clarity.

Is it wrong to enjoy life?

Enjoying a sunset,
a smile,
a touch,
a moment of beauty—
there is nothing wrong in that.

The problem arises
when thought says:

“I want more of it.”
“It must continue.”
“It must be repeated.”

It is the demand that corrupts.
Not the enjoyment.

Enjoyment is simple.
The demand for repetition is bondage.

Freedom Is the Understanding of Pleasure

When you understand the whole structure of pleasure—
not intellectually,
but by watching it in daily life—
you see the truth:

Pleasure is always tied to fear.
Pleasure is always tied to becoming.
Pleasure is always tied to suffering.

Seeing this without judgement,
without suppression,

brings freedom.

Freedom from the pressure to pursue,
freedom from dependency,
freedom from fear.

In that freedom
there arises a new quality of living:

a quiet joy,
a sensitivity to beauty,
a love that is not born of desire.

Where there is understanding,
there is the ending of pursuit.

And in that ending
is the beginning of a life
without conflict.

***

A Dialogue

“Why does the mind seek pleasure?”

Questioner:
Sir, you often speak about pleasure and desire.
I observe that my mind constantly seeks pleasure—
through relationships, work, entertainment, recognition.
Why is pleasure so central to our lives?
Can we understand this movement more deeply?

Teacher:
Sir, pleasure is something very simple at the beginning.
You see a sunset,

there is beauty.
Someone praises you,
there is warmth.
You taste a delicious meal,
there is delight.

These are natural, healthy sensations.

But thought takes hold of the sensation
and builds from it
a chain of desire.

The sensation ends—
but thought says,
"I must have that again."

This insistence on repetition
is what we call pleasure.

Pleasure is the continuation of sensation
by thought.

And thought, being memory,
is always old.

"So, pleasure is not the sensation itself?"

Questioner:
Are you saying that pleasure is not the original experience,
but the memory of it?

Teacher:
Precisely.

The moment of beauty

is not pleasure.
It is simply perception.

But when thought says,
“Oh, that was delightful—
let me have it again,”
pleasure begins.

Thought tries to extend an experience
that was complete in itself.

Where there is continuity of experience,
there must be pleasure.

And where there is pleasure,
there must also be fear.

Because pleasure demands duration—
and anything that demands duration
is afraid of ending.

“Is pleasure always tied to fear?”

Questioner:
Is fear always connected to pleasure?
Even simple pleasures?

Teacher:
Look at it carefully, sir.

When you enjoy someone’s affection,
immediately arises the fear
that you may lose it.

When you experience success,

there is the fear of failure.

When you taste a moment of joy,
thought fears its ending.

Fear is embedded in the pursuit of pleasure.

Pleasure brings dependence—
and dependence brings fear.

So, the two are inseparable.

Where there is pleasure,
there must be fear.

“What about pleasure in relationships?”

A woman stood up.

Questioner:
In relationships, sir,
pleasure seems inevitable.
Affection, companionship, physical closeness—
are these wrong?

Teacher:
Madam, be very attentive.

The problem is not enjoyment.
To enjoy a sunset,
a touch,
a word of kindness
is natural.

What becomes destructive

is when thought interferes
and demands repetition.

When affection becomes a memory
you want repeated,
it turns into attachment.

Attachment inevitably brings fear.

Fear brings jealousy,
possessiveness,
conflict.

So, the issue is not affection,
but the dependence on affection
that thought creates.

Thought uses relationship
as a means of pleasure.

And in doing so,
destroys the beauty of relationship.

Where pleasure becomes dominant,
love cannot be.

“Can pleasure ever be innocent?”

Questioner:
But surely, sir,
pleasure can be innocent?
Like listening to music,
or reading a beautiful poem,
or enjoying good food?

Teacher:
There is nothing wrong with enjoyment.
Enjoyment is natural.

Pleasure is enjoyment
plus, the demand for repetition.

It is the demand
that corrupts.

The mind says:

“I want more.”
“It should continue.”
“I must not lose it.”

That insistence breeds attachment.

Attachment breeds fear.

Fear brings suffering.

So, enjoyment is innocent;
pleasure is the corruption of enjoyment.

“Why do we cling to pleasure so strongly?”

Questioner:
Why does the mind cling to pleasure
even when it sees the suffering it brings?

Teacher:
Because the mind is conditioned
to escape from pain and boredom
through pleasure.

Pleasure becomes a drug.

When you feel lonely,
you seek entertainment.
When you feel inadequate,
you seek recognition.
When you feel insecure,
you seek attachment.

The mind uses pleasure
to cover its wounds.

But pleasure cannot heal—
it only masks.

And the wound continues.

Until the mind understands its wounds,
it will forever chase pleasure.

“How does pleasure prevent learning?”

Questioner:
You say that pleasure prevents understanding.
How does it prevent learning?

Teacher:
Pleasure makes the mind dull.

When the mind is seeking pleasure,
it is not free to observe.

It is always moving toward something:

toward reward,
toward comfort,
toward satisfaction.

This movement creates expectation.

Expectation blinds perception.

A mind that is occupied with getting something
cannot see what is.

Such a mind cannot learn.

Learning requires freedom—
freedom from motive.

Pleasure is always a motive.

“Is it possible to live without seeking pleasure?”

The hall became very still.

Questioner:
Sir, is it possible to live
without any psychological pursuit of pleasure?

Would life not become dry, joyless, mechanical?

Teacher:
On the contrary.

Pleasure is mechanical.
It is the repetition of memory.

Joy is not repetition.

Joy comes when the mind is completely attentive,
completely present.

In joy, there is no centre saying,
"I must have more."

Pleasure is of the mind.
Joy is of the whole being.

Joy is not sought—
it comes when the mind is quiet.

A mind free of the pursuit of pleasure
is extraordinarily alive,
sensitive,
capable of affection,
capable of love.

Such a mind knows beauty
in every moment.

"How does pleasure end?"

Questioner:
How does one end the psychological pursuit of pleasure?

Through discipline?
Control?
Renunciation?

Teacher:
Not at all.

Discipline is another form of desire—

the desire to be something else.

Renunciation is still the self
trying to achieve.

Control is suppression,
and whatever is suppressed
returns with greater force.

So, none of these bring freedom.

Pleasure ends
when you understand its entire structure.

To see:

- how pleasure begins,
- how thought prolongs it,
- how desire strengthens it,
- how fear accompanies it,
- how suffering follows it—

is to end pleasure.

The very seeing
is the ending.

Not tomorrow,
not through a process,
but now.

A Stillness Descends

Teacher spoke softly:

Sir, the pursuit of pleasure

is the root of much sorrow.

But enjoyment is natural,
simple,
fresh.

To enjoy without seeking continuation
is intelligence.

To live without the pressure
to repeat pleasure
is freedom.

And in freedom,
there is love.

A mind free of the pursuit of pleasure
is a mind
that can meet life wholly,
without fear,
without dependence,
without conflict.

Such a mind
is a light unto itself.

The silence deepened—
not imposed,
but born of seeing.

*****

Relationship Based on Thought

Sir, relationship is one of the most vital things in life.
Without relationship, we cannot exist.
Life is relationship—
with people, with ideas, with nature, with oneself.

But the tragedy is this:
our relationships are not with human beings,
but with the images that thought creates about them.

Thought, which is always old,
always conditioned,
always limited,
interferes with the freshness of relationship.
And when thought enters relationship,
relationship loses its innocence,
its beauty,
its sacredness.

Let us explore this carefully, step by step.

Thought Creates Images About the Other

From the moment you meet someone,
thought begins to build an image:

- "He is kind,"
- "She hurt me,"
- "He belongs to me,"
- "She should behave like this,"
- "I expect this from him,"
- "I depend on her."

These images accumulate over time.

And gradually,
the person disappears,
and only the image remains.

You no longer relate to the living human being;
you relate to the memory you have stored.

So, the relationship becomes
two images talking to each other—
not two human beings.

Where there are images,
there is no relationship.

Thought Brings the Past into the Present

A relationship based on thought
is a relationship based on the past.

Thought remembers:

- every pleasure,
- every hurt,
- every insult,
- every fear,
- every disappointment.

The past becomes the filter
through which you look at the present.

So, you never meet the person
freshly,
newly,
directly.

The past intrudes
and corrupts the present.

Thought in Relationship Creates Fear

When you rely on the other for emotional comfort,
for security, for reassurance,
thought immediately begins to fear loss.

Thought says:

“What if he leaves me?”
“What if she changes?”
“What if I am not loved tomorrow?”

Fear becomes the shadow of attachment.

Where there is fear,
there must be control.

And where there is control,
there can be no love.

Thought Creates Possessiveness and Jealousy

Possessiveness arises
when thought says:

“This person is mine.”
“My partner must behave as I expect.”
“I have a right over them.”

But no human being
can ever belong to another.

Possessiveness is the fear of losing
what gives you pleasure.

From possessiveness
comes jealousy.

From jealousy
comes conflict.

Thought sustains the whole chain.

Thought Makes Relationship Mechanical

Because thought is repetitive,
relationship becomes repetitive.

You repeat the same patterns:

- the same arguments,
- the same hurts,
- the same apologies,
- the same expectations.

Life in relationship becomes
a routine of memory.

The living quality of affection
withers.

The spark of love
is replaced by the mechanical movement
of thought seeking pleasure and security.

Thought Cannot Love

Thought is limited.

Thought is fragmentary.
Thought is based on past experience.

Love is not.

Love is not memory.
Love is not desire.
Love is not fear.
Love is not attachment.

Love is not born of thought.

Therefore:

A relationship based on thought
cannot contain love.

Thought can promise love,
talk about love,
seek love,
but it cannot love.

Where thought builds relationship,
love dies.

Relationship Has Meaning Only in Freedom

A relationship is alive
only when each person is free:

- free from the image of the other,
- free from the image of oneself,
- free from fear,
- free from possession,
- free from demands,
- free from expectation.

Freedom does not mean irresponsibility.
It means clarity.

In clarity there is affection.
In clarity there is sensitivity.
In clarity there is compassion.

Only a free mind can love.
And only love can sustain relationship.

Everything else—
thought, desire, attachment—
inevitably leads to conflict.

To See This Clearly Is the Ending of Conflict

You cannot fight the images
thought creates.

You cannot discipline the mind
not to remember hurt.

You cannot force yourself
to love.

But if you see
with complete attention
the whole movement of thought in relationship—
how it creates images,
how it clings to memory,
how it breeds fear—

that very seeing
is the ending of distortion.

In that ending
there is a new beginning.

A relationship reborn in clarity
is a relationship in which the human being
is actually seen
—not the image.

And where there is seeing,
there is love.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, why do our relationships become so painful?”

Questioner:
Sir, we all long for good relationships—
in marriage, with our children, with friends,
with colleagues, with society.
But so often, these relationships become heavy,
full of conflict, misunderstanding, fear.
Why does this happen?
Why do relationships deteriorate?

Teacher:
Madam, let us look at this together.
Not accepting what I say,
but observing it as you would observe a flower—
gently, without prejudice.

Relationship becomes painful
because it is based on thought.

Thought builds the structure of relationship:
“My husband,”
“My wife,”
“My friend,”
“My companion.”

These labels, these images,
become more important
than the living human being.

Where thought operates,
relationship loses its freshness,
its beauty,
its sensitivity.

Let’s go into this step by step.

“Are you saying we relate through images?”

Questioner:
Do you mean that we don’t relate to people directly
but through some mental picture?

Teacher:
Exactly, sir.

From the first moment you meet someone,
thought begins to form an image:

- what you like about them,
- what you dislike,
- how they behave,
- how they should behave,
- the pleasure they give,
- the hurts they cause,
- the expectations you hold.

Over time, this image becomes very strong.

And the tragedy is this:
you relate to the image, not the person.

The person is alive, moving, changing.
But your image is fixed, dead.

So, you never actually meet another human being;
you meet your own projection.

Two images relating
cannot bring harmony.

“Is this why we misunderstand each other?”

Questioner:
Is this the root of misunderstanding—
that we look at each other through the past?

Teacher:
Yes, sir.

The past—your memories, hurts, pleasures—
stands like a curtain between you and another.

So, you do not hear what the other says;
you hear your interpretation.

You do not see what the other is;
you see what you expect, what you fear,
what you want them to be.

The past becomes the interpreter

of the present.

Where the past dictates the present,
there must be distortion.
There must be conflict.

“How does thought create fear in relationship?”

A young man spoke, his voice uncertain.

Questioner:
In my relationships,
I feel anxiety about losing the other.
I worry constantly.
Is this also part of thought?

Teacher:
Of course.

Thought seeks continuity.
It says:

“I must keep this affection.”
“I must never lose this person.”
“I depend on them emotionally.”

With dependence comes fear.

Fear creates possessiveness.
Possessiveness demands control.
Control breeds conflict.

Where thought produces the fear of loss,
love cannot exist.

Love has no fear in it.
But thought always has fear.

“Why do we cling to others?”

Questioner:
Why do we depend on others so much?
Why do we cling?

Teacher:
Because inwardly we are empty,
lonely,
uncertain.

We look to others
to fill that emptiness.

We want them
to assure us we are loved,
to give us comfort,
to take away loneliness.

But no one can fill that emptiness.

When emptiness depends on another for fulfilment,
it becomes fear.

Fear becomes attachment.
Attachment becomes suffering.

This entire movement
is the movement of thought.

“Does thought also create jealousy?”

Questioner:
When I see my partner talking warmly to someone else,
I feel jealous.
Is this also thought?

Teacher:
Jealousy is the fear
of losing the source of your pleasure.

Thought says:

"That person gives me comfort,
therefore, they are mine."

Thought creates the image:

"I possess them."

When that image is threatened,
jealousy arises.

Jealousy is the defence
of pleasure and possession.

Where possession exists,
love cannot.

Love is freedom—
never ownership.

"Can there be relationship without thought?"

The hall became intensely silent.

Questioner:

Sir, is it at all possible
to have a relationship without thought?
Is that realistic?

Teacher:
Let us understand something fundamental.

Thought is necessary in daily living—
to remember where you live,
to do your work,
to operate machines.

But thought has no place
in the realm of psychological relationship.

Psychologically,
the moment thought interferes,
relationship becomes burdened.

A relationship without the psychological interference of thought
is a relationship in which the past
does not dictate the present.

It is relationship in which you meet the other
freshly,
newly,
each moment.

Such relationship is alive,
vibrant,
sacred.

This is not idealism—
it is the only real basis for love.

“But how do we stop thought from interfering?”

Questioner:
How do I stop creating images
and projecting them onto others?

Teacher:
You cannot “stop” image-making.
Any attempt to stop
is still thought acting.

What you can do
is observe the movement of thought
without resistance,
without condemnation,
without justification.

See the image forming
as it forms.

See how quickly thought remembers a hurt.
See how quickly it demands pleasure.
See how it builds expectation.

This very act of observation
ends the unconscious movement.

When you see the danger of something
as you see the danger of a cobra,
the very seeing is action.

Here too,
the seeing ends the image.

“What happens to relationship when the images end?”

Questioner:
If images end—
if thought does not interfere—
what happens to relationship?

Teacher:
Then relationship becomes something extraordinary.

There is no burden of the past.
No resentment.
No fear.
No possession.

You meet the other
in each moment
as they are.

You look without motive.
You listen without defence.
You care without dependence.

Such relationship is
freedom,
love,
and intelligence in action.

Where there is no image,
there is no conflict.

And where there is no conflict,
relationship becomes a source of clarity,
not sorrow.

The Hall Falls Silent

Teacher spoke softly:

Sir, relationship based on thought
is not relationship.
It is memory.
It is image.
It is the past.

Where thought dominates,
love withers.

To understand this fully
is to open the door
to a relationship that has no shadow,
no fear,
no hurt.

Such relationship
is the flowering of goodness.

It is sacred.

The hall remained still,
as though touched by something
profound and tender.

*****

What Shall I Do with Fear?

Sir, every human being, from the poorest villager to the most powerful ruler,
from the child to the old man nearing death,
carries fear in the depths of the mind.

Fear of loneliness,
fear of failure,
fear of loss,
fear of hurt,
fear of not being loved,
fear of death,
fear of what we are
and what we are not.

Fear is the shadow that walks beside us.

So, the question, “What shall I do with fear?”
is not a casual question.
It touches the very root of human suffering.

Let us look at it carefully,
not merely intellectually,
but with the seriousness of one
who must understand this now,
because postponement is the nourishment of fear.

You Cannot Do Anything “About” Fear

As soon as you ask,
“What shall I do with fear?”
you are already in conflict.

Because the “doer”—the one asking the question—
wants to escape fear.

The very question implies action by thought:

- resisting fear
- suppressing fear
- escaping fear
- replacing fear
- analyzing fear
- explaining fear
- distracting yourself from fear

All such actions
strengthen fear.

You cannot do anything about fear
because the “you” that is doing
is fear.

This must be seen, not merely heard.

Fear Cannot Be Controlled or Conquered

You have tried control, haven’t you?

You have tried:

- prayer
- willpower
- courage
- positive thinking
- rationalization
- discipline
- intoxication
- distraction
- repetition of mantras

- religious images
- psychological explanations

But fear returns,
because all these are movements of thought.

And thought is the origin of fear.

Thought creates fear as:

- fear of tomorrow,
- fear of memory,
- fear of what happened yesterday.

Thought projects the unknown
onto the known.

You cannot conquer fear
through the activity of fear.

Fear Exists Only When You Do Not Look at It Completely

You must observe fear
as you would observe a living thing—
without wanting to change it,
without wanting to move away from it,
without interpreting it.

Fear lives because
you never look at it fully.

You touch it and recoil.
You feel it and instantly escape.
You sense it and distract yourself.

If you turn your back to fear,
fear walks behind you.

If you run from fear,
fear runs faster.

But if you face fear completely,
fear has no space in which to grow.

To Look at Fear, You Must Stop Naming It

The moment you say,
“I am afraid,”
you have already separated yourself from fear.

The word “fear”
prevents you from seeing the actual sensation.

The word is memory.
The sensation is immediate.

If you watch the sensation
without the word—
the tightening of the chest,
the quickened breath,
the surge of energy—
you will see something extraordinary:

The sensation is not frightening.
It is simply a sensation.

It is thought that names it “fear,”
and with the naming
comes the whole machinery of escape.

Seeing the danger of naming
is the beginning of freedom from fear.

Fear Ends When the Movement of Escape Ends

Fear remains
because you are always running from it:

- through entertainment,
- through work,
- through relationships,
- through alcohol,
- through meditation techniques,
- through religion,
- through achievement.

The escapes feed fear.

When the mind stops escaping,
fear stands alone.

And when fear stands alone,
with no movement away,
no resistance,
no choice—
it begins to dissolve.

It is the running away
that gives fear strength.

Stay with fear,
hold it gently,
look at it with complete attention.

What is fully seen
fully ends.

Fear Ends in the Light of Awareness

Awareness is the flame
that burns away psychological fear.

Not effort,
not discipline,
not suppression.

Awareness.

To be aware of fear means:

- to watch it arise,
- to watch its movement,
- to watch the images it brings,
- to watch how memory sustains it,
- to watch how thought nourishes it.

This observation must be choiceless—
without wanting fear to vanish.

If you observe fear
without motive,
without resistance,
without escape,
then fear reveals its entire structure.

When the mind sees the truth
that fear is created by thought,
and thought is always limited—
that very seeing
is the ending of fear.

Not tomorrow.

Not slowly.
But instantly.

Fear ends
when there is complete attention.

The Ending of Fear Is the Beginning of Freedom

When fear ends,
your mind is no longer a prisoner.

It becomes clear,
sensitive,
fresh.

You are free to love
without dependence.
Free to act
without hesitation.
Free to meet life
without the shadow of yesterday.
Free to die to every moment
and live anew.

A life without fear
is not heroic;
it is natural.

It is the life of a mind
that has understood itself.

So, what shall you do with fear?

Nothing.

Do nothing.
Do not fight.
Do not run.
Do not suppress.
Do not analyse.
Do not interpret.

Simply look.
Look with the whole of your being.

Let fear flower fully in awareness—
and in that flowering,
it ends.

Where fear ends,
love begins.
Intelligence awakens.
Life becomes vast, unburdened,
and immeasurably beautiful.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, I am afraid. What shall I do with fear?”

Questioner:
Sir, fear follows me everywhere—
fear of losing my job,
fear of illness,
fear of losing the people I love,
fear of loneliness,
fear of the future.
I have tried prayer, meditation, discipline, positive thinking—
but fear always returns.

What shall I do with fear?

Teacher:
Sir, before we ask what to do with fear,
we must understand who is asking that question.

Who is the "I" that wants to act upon fear?

Is the "I" separate from fear?

Or is the "I" itself
part of the movement of fear?

If the "I" is fear,
then any action that "I" takes
is still the movement of fear.

Therefore,
the one who asks the question
is not separate from fear.

This must be understood completely.

"But I feel fear as something happening to me."

Questioner:
It seems as though fear is something that comes over me—
that I experience fear,
that it happens to me.

Teacher:
That is one of the illusions thought creates.

Thought says:
"I am afraid."

“I must overcome fear.”
“I must suppress it.”
“I must escape it.”

But the “I” is built by thought—
as memory, experience, conditioning.

Fear also is built by thought—
as memory, anticipation, projection.

So thought creates both:

- the “I,”
- and the fear which the “I” resists.

This division is artificial.

When you see this honestly,
the division between the observer and the observed
begins to dissolve.

Then you see:

The observer is fear.

And when the observer is the observed,
there is no conflict.

Where there is no conflict,
fear begins to lose its nourishment.

“Does fear always come from thought?”

Questioner:
But fear feels so physical—
my heart races,

my stomach tightens.
Is that also the result of thought?

Teacher:
There is physical fear—
such as when a snake crosses your path
or a car approaches too quickly.

The body reacts instantly.
That reaction is intelligence.

But psychological fear
is something entirely different.

Psychological fear comes from:

- the memory of past hurt,
- the anticipation of future pain,
- the desire for security,
- the fear of being alone,
- the fear of not being loved,
- the fear of death.

All this is the movement of thought.

Thought projects the future
based on the past.

It creates fear
by imagining what may happen.

It sustains fear
by remembering what has happened.

Therefore,
psychological fear

is the child of thought.

“If thought creates fear, should I stop thinking?”

A woman spoke now, her voice soft but insistent.

Questioner:
If thought is the source of fear,
should we try to stop thought?

Teacher:
You cannot stop thought.

Who is the one trying to stop thought?

Another fragment of thought.

Thought cannot control itself.
Any attempt to suppress thought
is still thought operating.

What you can do
is observe thought—
observe its movement,
its patterns,
its motives,
its assumptions.

When you observe thought
without resistance
and without the desire to control,
thought finds its natural place.

Then thought does not interfere
in psychological matters.

It becomes quiet,
like a child that has understood something clearly.

In that quietness,
fear has no soil.

“Why does fear continue even when I try not to be afraid?”

Questioner:
I try so hard not to be afraid,
yet fear persists.
Why?

Teacher:
Because the effort to not be afraid
is itself a form of fear.

The moment you say,
“I must overcome fear,”
you have already created conflict.

Conflict strengthens fear.

You cannot overcome fear
through will,
through discipline,
through courage,
through prayer,
through substitution.

All such efforts
are movements of escape.

Escape nourishes fear.

To understand fear,
you must not run away.

You must look at it completely.

“How do I look at fear completely?”

Questioner:
I want to understand this.
What does it mean to look at fear completely?

Teacher:
To look completely
is to look without choice.

To look without naming the sensation as “fear,”
without condemning it,
without wanting it to end,
without escaping.

When the thought says “fear,”
the whole network of reactions begins.

But if you watch the sensation itself—
the tightening of the chest,
the trembling of the nerves—
without the word,
you see something entirely different.

You see that the sensation
is not frightening.

It is thought
that adds interpretation
and therefore fear.

To look at fear
without the movement of thought

is to end fear.

“Can one face fear without running away?”

The hall became still.

Questioner:
Sir, fear feels overwhelming.
Can a person really face fear directly
without escaping?

Teacher:
One can—
when there is understanding
that escape is the cause of fear.

Fear is like a shadow.
It grows as you turn away from it.

The more you run,
the more it follows.

But when you stay with fear—
not as an idea,
but as a living sensation—
when you look at it fully,
without trying to change it,
you will discover something extraordinary.

Fear begins to unfold,
to reveal its structure.

And in the very act of seeing,
it ends.

Fear ends
when the mind observes it
without the observer.

“Is there an action that ends fear immediately?”

Questioner:
Can fear end instantly?
Or does it require time?

Teacher:
Fear ends instantly
when you see its truth.

Time does not end fear.

You have carried fear for years—
time has not helped.
More time will not help.

Only insight ends fear.

Insight comes
not through analysis,
not through effort,
but through complete attention.

When the mind sees
the totality of fear—
how it is born,
how it operates,
how it is nourished—
that seeing brings a quietness
in which fear has no place.

Insight is immediate.

Therefore, the ending of fear
is also immediate.

“What is life like without fear?”

A young woman asked softly:

Questioner:
If fear ends,
what remains?
What is a life without fear?

Teacher:
A life without fear
is a life of tremendous beauty.

In such a life,
love is possible.

Love that is not attachment,
not dependence,
not possession.

A mind without fear
is a mind that can look without distortion,
act without hesitation,
learn without self-protection.

It is a mind
that is fresh, innocent, vulnerable,
and therefore, truly intelligent.

Without fear,
there is freedom.

And freedom is the essence
of a religious life.

The Hall Falls Silent

Teacher spoke

Sir, fear comes from thought.
Thought is always limited.
Therefore, anything born of thought
must be limited.

Fear ends
when you observe it
without the observer.

To look at fear
with total attention
is to end fear.

This is the beauty
of understanding.

Not the promise of tomorrow,
not the struggle of discipline,
but the immediate seeing
that frees the mind.

Where fear ends,
love begins.

The silence was profound—
as though the whole hall was breathing
in a completely new way.

*****

Ending Prejudice

Sir, prejudice is one of the deepest forms of human blindness.
It lives in the shadows of the mind,
often unseen, unchallenged, unexamined.

It divides human beings:
by nation,
by religion,
by race,
by caste,
by language,
by ideology,
by custom,
by belief.

Prejudice is the conditioning
that shapes our perceptions
before we even look.

And where there is prejudice,
there can be no love,
no intelligence,
no relationship.

Let us examine it together, carefully.

Prejudice Is a Movement of the Past

Prejudice is never born in the present.

It is inherited—
from society,

from culture,
from parents,
from books,
from symbols,
from propaganda.

It is carried in memory
as conclusions:

- "My group is superior."
- "Those people are dangerous."
- "This religion is true."
- "Those beliefs are ignorant."
- "This caste is noble."
- "That race is inferior."

These statements are not observations.
They are the past speaking through you.

And the past cannot meet the present
without distortion.

Prejudice Is the Voice of the Self

The self—
with its need for identity,
security,
importance—
creates walls around itself.

These walls become
our group,
our nation,
our religion,
our tradition.

The self takes pride in belonging
to something larger than itself.

Prejudice is the self enlarged
by an idea.

When the self expands through identification,
it inevitably excludes others.

Where there is exclusion,
there must be conflict.

Prejudice Prevents Perception

When you look at another human being
with a label—

- Hindu,
- Muslim,
- Christian,
- atheist,
- upper caste,
- lower caste,
- foreigner,
- Indian—

you are not looking at the human being.

You are looking at the label.

The moment you name,
you cease to see.

The word becomes more important
than the person.

Prejudice is the substitution of the symbol
for the living reality.

Prejudice Cannot End Through Education or Persuasion

You can read holy books,
listen to moral teachers,
repeat noble principles—
yet prejudice remains.

Why?

Because prejudice is emotional,
deep-rooted,
psychological.

It gives the mind
a sense of belonging.

And whatever gives comfort
resists change.

You cannot remove prejudice
through punishment,
through argument,
through explanation.

Prejudice ends
only through seeing.

To End Prejudice, You Must See It in Yourself

It is easy to identify prejudice in others.
It is far more difficult

to discover it in oneself.

You must look at yourself humbly,
without justification,
without condemnation.

Observe:

- your instant reactions,
- your hidden biases,
- the subtle superiority you feel over others,
- the groups you identify with,
- the groups you dismiss,
- the images you carry about people.

To see your own prejudice
is already the beginning of ending it.

Awareness is the light
that dissolves darkness.

Question Every Assumption

Prejudice survives
because assumptions are never questioned.

You must question:

- Why do I belong to this group?
- Why do I identify with this religion?
- Why do I accept this hierarchy?
- Why do I feel superior or inferior?
- Why do I distrust that person?
- Why do these labels matter so much?

In questioning,
the truth of your conditioning is revealed.

Truth liberates.
Conditioning imprisons.

The Ending of Prejudice Is the Ending of Division

Prejudice divides.

Where there is division,
there is conflict.

To end prejudice
is to end division within yourself.

A mind free of prejudice
does not think in terms of “us” and “them.”
It sees humanity as one movement—
not fragmented by beliefs or borders.

Such a mind
can never harm another.

Because it sees the other
as itself.

Love Is the Ending of Prejudice

Prejudice cannot end through effort.

It ends only through intelligence.

And intelligence flowers
in a mind free of fear,
free of comparison,
free of conditioning.

Where there is love—
not sentiment,
not emotion,
not attachment—
but love that arises
when the self is quiet—
prejudice simply cannot exist.

Love dissolves all walls.

Love sees no caste,
no religion,
no race,
no nation.

Love sees only life.

Where love is,
prejudice has no place to take root.

And where there is no prejudice,
there is peace.

***

Prejudice is the projection of the self.
Where the self is,
prejudice must be.

To end prejudice,
the self must come to an end—
the self that seeks identity,
belonging,
superiority.

In the ending of the self,
there is compassion.

Compassion is not of any religion,
any caste,
any nation.

It is the perfume
of a mind that is free.

And where there is compassion,
prejudice cannot take root.

The hall remained silent—
a silence that felt tender,
sacred,
alive with understanding.

*****

If You Have an Image, You Are Going to Be Hurt

Sir, this is not a casual statement.
It is one of the most fundamental truths
about human relationship and human suffering.

The image you have about yourself
and the image you carry about another
are the very roots of hurt.

Where there is an image,
there must be vulnerability to pain.

Let us look into this slowly, carefully,
as though we are examining something
immensely subtle and delicate.

The Image Is the Past

The image you have of yourself—
your abilities,
your importance,
your failures,
your virtues,
your ambitions—
is all put together by thought.

It is based on:

- what people have told you,
- what society has praised or condemned,
- what you remember of success and failure,
- what you wish to be.

This image is entirely the past.

And the past tries to guide the present.

So, you live according to an image
instead of living in actuality.

That contradiction
is the beginning of hurt.

The Image Must Be Protected

When you have an image:

"I am this,"
"I must be respected,"
"I must be appreciated,"
"I am a good person,"

you must also protect it.

You become anxious
that someone might expose you,
criticize you,
reject you,
ignore you.

So, the mind becomes defensive,
sensitive,
vulnerable.

The very existence of the image
creates fear.

And fear always invites hurt.

You Feel Hurt Only When the Image Is Touched

A word, a look, a gesture—
and instantly you feel wounded.

But what is actually being hurt?

Not you as a living human being,
but the image
you have about yourself.

If someone calls you “stupid,”
the hurt arises because
you have an image of yourself
as intelligent, capable, adequate.

If you had no image,
the word “stupid” would have no place to land.

It would pass through the mind
like wind through the leaves.

It is the image
that gets bruised—
not you.

The Image You Carry of Others Also Creates Hurt

You also carry images of others:

- what your partner should be,
- how your children should behave,
- how your friends should treat you,
- how your colleagues should respect you.

These images create expectation.

Expectation guarantees disappointment.

When others do not conform
to your image of them,
you feel betrayed,
offended,
wounded.

So, the hurt is not caused by others—
but by the image you hold about them.

The Image Creates Dependency

A relationship built on image
is not a relationship at all.

You depend on your partner
to confirm your image.

You depend on society
to validate your image.

When the world does not reflect
what you believe you are,
hurt appears.

Dependency breeds fear.
Fear breeds hurt.

The self-image
and hurt
are inseparable.

The Image Prevents Perception

When you carry an image of yourself,
you cling to certainty.

This very clinging
prevents learning.

You cannot see what you are
because the image stands in the way.

And because the image must be maintained,
you resist anything
that contradicts it.

This resistance to truth
is itself hurtful.

Truth liberates.
Image confines.

Where There Is an Image, There Can Be No Love

Love demands vulnerability—
not the vulnerability of fear,
but of openness, of freshness.

The image deadens this tenderness.

When you have an image of yourself,
you are always calculating:

- "How do I appear?"
- "What do they think of me?"
- "Am I loved?"
- "Am I important?"

This self-occupation
makes love impossible.

Love is not self-concern.
Love is not an image.

Where the image ends,
love begins.

The Ending of Hurt Lies in the Ending of the Image

You cannot prevent others
from speaking harshly.

You cannot control
how the world behaves.

But you can understand
why you are hurt.

You are hurt
because the image has been touched.

So, the solution
is not to build stronger images,
nor to become indifferent,
nor to escape society.

The only true solution
is to look at the image
and see it for what it is:

a bundle of memories
trying to maintain itself.

When you see the falseness of the image,
it loses its authority.

In that seeing,
the image withers away.

And with its ending,
hurt ends.

The Mind Without Image Is Invulnerable

Invulnerable not in the sense of being hard,
closed,
or indifferent—

but invulnerable because
there is nothing to defend.

When the image ends,
you are free.

You meet life freshly,
without resistance,
without comparison.

A mind without image
is a mind that cannot be hurt.

A heart without image
is a heart that loves.

The Ending of Image Is the Beginning of Intelligence

When the mind sees

the truth that image is illusion,
that image is the creator of hurt,
and that image divides human beings—

in that very seeing
lies action.

Not the action of will,
not the action of effort,
but the action of intelligence.

Intelligence ends the image.

And when the image ends,
the mind becomes innocent,
sensitive,
capable of relationship,
capable of love.

Such a mind
is a light unto itself.

***

A Dialogue

"Sir, why are we so easily hurt?"

Questioner:
Sir, I find that I am hurt very easily—
by criticism,
by rejection,
by small comments,
by people I care about.
Why are we all so vulnerable?
Why do words or actions of others

wound us so deeply?

Teacher:
Madam, let us look at this slowly.
When you say you are hurt,
what exactly is hurt?

Is it your body?
Your physical being?

Or is it something else—
something more subtle?

It is not the body that is hurt.
It is the image you have about yourself.

The image says:
"I must be respected,"
"I must be loved,"
"I must not be criticised."

When someone touches this image,
you feel wounded.

Therefore,
it is the image that is hurt—
not you.

"I don't fully understand. How is the image formed?"

Questioner:
What is this image?
How do we create it?

Teacher:

Thought creates the image.

From childhood,
people tell you:

“You are clever.”
“You are stupid.”
“You are beautiful.”
“You are worthless.”
“You must become someone great.”

These statements accumulate
as memory,
as conditioning.

You also create images
through your own experiences:

the praise you enjoyed,
the success you achieved,
the failure you regret,
the hurt you received.

All this thought gathers
and builds a picture about yourself.

This picture is the image—
a bundle of memories
to which you cling.

When you cling,
you must protect it.

And whatever must be protected
must also be vulnerable.

Thus, if you have an image,
you are bound to be hurt.

“So, the image is always of the past?”

Questioner:
Then the image is not living?
It is always old?

Teacher:
Exactly.

The image is the past—
a memory of what you think you are.

It is static,
fixed,
dead.

But life is constantly moving,
changing,
flowing.

When the dead weight of the past
meets the movement of the present,
conflict arises.

And conflict is itself a form of hurt.

The image cannot adapt
to reality.

Therefore,
it is in perpetual danger.

“Why do we cling to this image?”

A middle-aged professor rose, troubled.

Questioner:
Sir, if the image causes so much pain,
why do we hold onto it?

Teacher:
Because the image gives you
a sense of identity.

You say:
“I am this,”
“I am that.”

The image becomes
a psychological shelter.

But it is a false shelter.

It gives the feeling of security—
but it is fragile.

When someone contradicts the image,
the illusion of security breaks.

You are hurt.

So, the hurt reveals
the falseness of the image.

“Does the image create fear?”

Questioner:
Whenever I feel hurt,
I also feel fear—
fear of being hurt again.
Are the image and fear connected?

Teacher:
They are inseparable.

The image must be defended.
Defence creates fear.

Fear creates cautiousness:
"I must not show my weakness."
"I must not be vulnerable."
"I must not allow anyone to see who I am."

This fear isolates you.

Isolation strengthens the image.

So, fear and image
feed each other.

A mind with an image
must live in fear.

"What about the images we have of others?"

A young man lifted his hand.

Questioner:
Sir, we not only have images of ourselves,
we also carry images of others:
our family,
our friends,

our colleagues.
Do these images also cause hurt?

Teacher:
Indeed.

You have an image of your partner:
how they should behave,
how they should love you.

You have an image of your child:
how they should fulfil your hopes.

You have an image of your friend:
how they should treat you.

These images create expectation.

Expectation guarantees disappointment.

When others do not conform
to your image of them,
you feel betrayed.

But it is the image,
not the person,
that has been contradicted.

Thus, you hurt yourself
with your own imagination.

“Can a relationship based on images ever be healthy?”

Questioner:
If we carry so many images,
does that mean our relationships
are always in conflict?

Teacher:
When you relate to another
through an image,
you never meet the person.

You meet your own projection.

Two shadows relating
cannot create harmony.

A relationship based on images
is a relationship of fear—
fear of losing the image,
fear of being exposed,
fear of change.

Where there is fear,
there can be no love.

Love is possible
only when the image ends.

"How do I end the image?"

The hall grew intensely still.

Questioner:
Sir, if the image causes hurt,
how do I end it?
What must I do?

Teacher:
You cannot do anything.

Any effort to end the image
creates another image:
"I am the one who will succeed."
"I am the one who will be free."

That is still the self-image.

Effort belongs to thought.
Thought builds the image.

Therefore, effort
cannot dissolve the image.

What you can do
is observe the image-making process
as it happens.

Observe:

- how you react to praise,
- how you clutch at compliments,
- how you resist criticism,
- how quickly thought builds a picture,
- how you defend that picture.

Just observe—
without condemnation,
without justification,
without resistance.

In that very observation
the image loses its energy.

The flame of attention
burns away the image.

“Can I live without any image at all?”

A woman near the front spoke softly.

Questioner:
Sir, is it possible
to live without any image—
of oneself,

of others?

Teacher:
It is not only possible—
it is necessary
if you wish to live without hurt.

A mind without image
is a mind without defence.

And because it does not defend,
it cannot be wounded.

It is not hard or insensitive.
On the contrary,
it is extraordinarily sensitive,
open,
vulnerable in the best sense.

Such vulnerability
is not weakness.
It is intelligence.

When there is no image,
one meets life directly,
freshly.

And in that freshness
there is great beauty.

The Hall Falls into Deep Silence

Teacher spoke softly:

Sir, if you have an image,
you are going to be hurt.
This is an absolute fact.

The image is the past.
The past cannot meet the present
without conflict.

To see this clearly—
without argument,
without escape—
is the beginning of freedom.

Freedom from hurt
is not the building of stronger images,
but the ending of all images.

In that ending
there is tremendous love.

A mind without image
is a mind capable of love.

And where love is,
there is no hurt.

The silence deepened—
a silence that carried
the fragrance of truth.

*****

We Crave to Be Free but Get Trapped

Sir, every human being, whether living in a crowded city or in a quiet village,
whether rich or poor, old or young,
carries within himself a deep longing for freedom.

Freedom from fear.
Freedom from sorrow.
Freedom from conflict.
Freedom from the endless pressure of becoming.
Freedom to live without the shadow of yesterday.

This longing is natural,
as natural as a seed pushing through the soil toward sunlight.

But strangely,
the moment we seek freedom,
we get trapped.

Let us look into this very quietly, carefully.

We Seek Freedom Through the Instruments of Bondage

When the mind feels confined or burdened,
it tries to escape—
through action, belief, relationship, ambition, spirituality.

But the escape is always within the field of the known.

We try to be free through:

- cultivating discipline

- repeating mantras
- joining religious institutions
- acquiring knowledge
- building social identity
- pursuing pleasure
- seeking psychological comfort
- improving ourselves through ideals
- attaching to gurus
- seeking enlightenment, salvation, heaven

These become new cages—
more polished, more decorated,
but still cages.

We seek freedom through thought,
but thought itself is limitation.

So, the seeker becomes the prisoner.

The Desire for Freedom Is Itself a Trap

Observe closely.

The moment you say:

“I must be free,”
“I must overcome this,”
“I must become peaceful,”

you have already created
a division in the mind.

There is the “you”
and the state you must reach.

This division is conflict.

Conflict can never lead to freedom.

The desire for freedom
creates a future ideal,
and you begin to chase that ideal.

But the chaser is thought.
The ideal is thought.
The chase is thought.

Therefore, freedom becomes
another projection of the mind.

Anything projected by thought
is bound by thought.

Thus, the very desire to be free
becomes bondage.

We Replace One Prison with Another

A person trapped in loneliness
escapes into relationship.

A person trapped in relationship
escapes into solitude.

A person trapped in sorrow
escapes into religion.

A person trapped in religion
escapes into doubt.

We keep shifting rooms
within the same prison.

We never question
the prison itself.

The mind moves from one corner to another,
imagining movement is freedom.

When you move from one belief to another,
one guru to another,
one philosophy to another,
you are merely rearranging the furniture
inside the prison cell.

We Get Trapped Because We Never Look at "What Is"

The mind wants to run away
from its loneliness,
its emptiness,
its fear,
its sorrow.

We never look directly
at these inner movements.

We never sit quietly
with our own psychological wounds.

The running away
creates more confusion,
more fear,
more craving.

Escape strengthens the thing you escape from.

And every escape
builds a new wall around the mind.

Freedom Is Not at the End of Effort

Freedom is not the reward of a system.
It is not the result of practice.
It is not the culmination of becoming.

Freedom is not tomorrow.

Freedom is not in the future.

Freedom is now
or not at all.

And freedom begins
when the mind sees its own traps clearly—
not partially,
not theoretically,
but totally.

When you see how thought creates fear,
how memory sustains sorrow,
how comparison breeds envy,
how ambition generates conflict,
how desire manufactures illusion—

that very seeing
is the ending of the trap.

Insight is freedom.

Freedom Comes When You Stop Becoming

All becoming is bondage.

“I will be peaceful.”
“I will be enlightened.”
“I will be successful.”
“I will overcome this.”

These are all movements of becoming—
movements away from what is.

When you remain with “what is”
without escape,
without condemnation,
without comparison—
the mind becomes simple,
quiet,
clear.

In that clarity,
the prison dissolves.

Freedom is not something you achieve.
Freedom is something that flowers
when the movement of escape ends.

To See the Trap Is to End the Trap

“To see the false as false
is the beginning of the true.”

When the mind sees—
not as a theory
but as a fact—
that its every movement to seek freedom

creates bondage,

a strange thing happens.

The mind stops chasing.

In that stopping,
there is immense energy.

That energy
is freedom.

Not freedom from something—
which is another form of bondage—
but freedom in itself.

Freedom that is whole,
transparent,
alive.

A mind that is free
does not crave.

A mind that craves
can never be free.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, why is it that we want freedom but never seem to attain it?”

Questioner:
Sir, everywhere one hears people say,
“I want to be free.”

Free from fear,
free from conditioning,
free from sorrow,
free from authority,
free from the past.
But somehow,
in seeking freedom,
we fall into new forms of bondage.
Why does this happen?

Teacher:
Sir, freedom is a word
with extraordinary depth and beauty.
But before we ask how to attain freedom,
we must understand the mind
that is asking for it.

Who is it that seeks freedom?
And from what does he seek to be free?

Unless we understand the seeker,
the search becomes another trap.

“I seek freedom from pain, fear, confusion.”

Questioner:
I seek freedom from the things that trouble me—
my loneliness,
my anxieties,
my ambitions that exhaust me,
my failures,
my childhood burden.
What is wrong in wanting freedom from these things?

Teacher:

Nothing is wrong with wanting freedom.
But the desire for freedom
may itself be the source of bondage.

When you say,
“I want to be free from something,”
you create resistance,
and resistance strengthens the thing resisted.

To fight fear
is to nourish fear.
To escape loneliness
is to increase loneliness.
To suppress sorrow
is to deepen sorrow.

The very desire to run away
creates the prison.

“Are you saying that my search for freedom is the trap?”

Questioner:
Sir, are you saying
that the search for freedom
is itself the trap?

Teacher:
Yes, indeed.

To seek freedom
is already to be caught in the network of thought.

Thought says,
“I must be free.”

Thought then projects an ideal image of freedom—
something to be achieved.

But thought is limited,
fragmented,
based on memory.

Anything created by thought
must also be limited.

Therefore, the freedom you seek
through thought
is already a form of imprisonment.

“But thought is all we have! How can we go beyond it?”

A woman spoke with concern.

Questioner:
Sir, thought is all we know.
Without thought,
how can we function?
How can we go beyond it?

Teacher:
We are not saying
you must reject thought entirely.
Thought is necessary
to speak,
to work,
to communicate,
to build technology.

But thought must not enter
the psychological field

where freedom is required.

Thought can create order in daily living—
but it can never create inward freedom.

Freedom is not the product of time,
effort,
or will.

It comes when thought understands its own limitation.

“We escape from problems instead of looking at them.”

Questioner:
Sir, I see that I escape from my problems—
from fear,
from hurt,
from boredom,
from emptiness.
I escape through work,
through religion,
through entertainment,
through relationships.
Are these escapes the reason I remain trapped?

Teacher:
Yes, absolutely.

Every escape strengthens
what you escape from.

Your problem is like a shadow.
The more you run,
the more it follows.

Escape is the movement of fear.
And fear builds walls.

The walls become the prison.

So, the question is:
Can you look at your fear
without running away?
Without naming it,
without resisting it,
without wishing to change it?

To look at fear directly
is to end its power.

“Why do we run away from our own suffering?”

Questioner:
Sir, why is it so difficult
to face our own suffering?
Why do we avoid it?

Teacher:
Because suffering reveals the truth
of what we actually are.

We prefer the comfort of illusions.
We cling to beliefs,
to identities,
to philosophies,
to hopes,
to dreams.

Suffering shatters illusions.

The mind resists such shattering
because the self is built out of illusions.

To escape suffering
is to protect the self.

And protecting the self
is the very essence of bondage.

“We replace one form of bondage with another, don’t we?”

Questioner:
Sir, when I escape from one problem,
I often fall into another.
It feels like I am constantly shifting prisons.

Teacher:
Exactly.

A man who feels lonely
seeks relationship.
Through that relationship
he soon feels confined
and seeks solitude.

A man tired of religion
turns to philosophy.
Tired of philosophy,
he goes back to religion.

A man who wants inner peace
joins a group or ashram—
and becomes a prisoner
of that structure.

We are always moving
from one trap to another
because we never question
the mind that creates the trap.

The prison is not outside—
it is inside.

“How can we stop creating new traps?”

The hall was very quiet now.

Questioner:
Sir, once we see that our escapes cause bondage,
how do we stop creating new traps?

Teacher:
By observing the movement of thought
without judgement.

Watch how thought seeks comfort,
certainty,
security.
Watch how it runs away from discomfort,
from uncertainty,
from truth.

This watchfulness
is not discipline.
It is intelligence.

When you observe the movement of escape
without condemning it,
without justifying it,

the escape loses energy.

In the very seeing
of its falsehood,
it drops away.

“So, freedom is not something we achieve?”

Questioner:
Then freedom is not the result
of effort or discipline?

Teacher:
No, sir.

Freedom is not an achievement.
It is not a reward.
It is not a destination.

Freedom is the state of mind
that sees
the whole structure
of its own bondage.

In that seeing,
bondage ends.

Freedom flowers
not in the future,
but in the present moment
when you understand yourself.

“What is the nature of this freedom?”

Questioner:

If freedom is not a goal,
not a conclusion,
what is its nature?

Teacher:
Freedom is the ending
of all psychological dependency.

It is the ending of self-centred activity.
It is the ending of fear.
It is the ending of conditioning.
It is the ending of conflict.

When the mind is free
from the known—
not rejecting it,
but not being dominated by it—
then the mind becomes simple,
innocent,
fresh.

In that freshness,
there is tremendous beauty.

Freedom is not "freedom from something"—
that is still bondage.
Freedom is
freedom in itself.

The Hall Falls Silent

Teacher spoke very softly:

Sir, we crave to be free
but get trapped

because we seek freedom
through the instruments of bondage.

Thought cannot lead to freedom.
Belief cannot lead to freedom.
Escape cannot lead to freedom.

Freedom begins
when the movement of becoming ends.

In the ending
of the struggle to become
lies a beauty
that cannot be described by words.

A mind that is free
is a light unto itself.

The silence deepened—
a silence in which one felt
the presence of truth.

*****

Observing Inwardly

Sir, we have spent centuries observing the world outside—
the stars, the oceans, the mountains,
the movements of nations,
the structures of society.

We have acquired immense technological skill,
mastered outer space,
transformed the environment,
and reshaped the Earth with our knowledge.

But inwardly
we remain primitive—
fearful,
conflicted,
lonely,
violent,
seeking pleasure,
avoiding pain,
chasing illusions,
repeating old patterns.

Outward observation has become extraordinarily subtle.
But inward observation has hardly begun.

To observe inwardly
is the beginning of intelligence.

Observation Is Not Analysis

Inward observation is not analysis.

Analysis divides the analyser from the analysed.

It assumes:

"I am here, separate from my thoughts,
and I am going to examine them."

But the "examiner" is a conditioned thought.
The observer is the observed.
The thinker is the thought.

Therefore, analysis only strengthens the self.
It does not free the mind.

Observation is entirely different.

Observation is without division.

It is the silent watching
of every movement within—
without naming,
without justifying,
without condemning.

Observation Begins with Awareness of Daily Life

Inward observation does not begin in meditation halls
or in solitary retreats.

It begins in the ordinary flow of daily life:

- how you speak to another,
- how you react when corrected,
- how you compare yourself to others,
- how you feel when ignored or praised,
- how you escape from boredom,
- how you chase pleasure,
- how you cling to beliefs.

To observe inwardly
is to see yourself in relationship.

Not the relationship you imagine,
but the relationship you live.

Life is your teacher
if you are willing to observe.

Observation Without Choice Is Crucial

Ordinarily, when we look inward,
we select what we like
and push away what we dislike.

This is not observation—
it is resistance.

Choice distorts perception.

Inward observation requires a mind
that looks without preference.

To see anger without judging it.
To see fear without trying to overcome it.
To see desire without pursuing or condemning it.
To see sorrow without escaping it.

Where there is no choice,
there is clarity.

Where there is clarity,
there is freedom.

Inward Observation Is in the Present

You cannot observe inwardly
with the memory of yesterday's observation.

The mind must be fresh—
not burdened by conclusions,
not dictated by previous knowledge.

Every moment the mind changes,
moves,
becomes something new.

To observe inwardly
means to see this movement
as it happens.

Now is the doorway
to inward understanding.

Tomorrow does not reveal anything new.
Only the present does.

Inward Observation Reveals the Structure of the Self

When you observe inwardly,
without resistance,
without escape,
the whole structure of the self
reveals itself:

- its fears,
- its hurts,
- its desires,
- its ambitions,
- its jealousies,
- its loneliness,
- its dependence on pleasure,
- its search for security.

This seeing is not intellectual.

It is like watching a stream—
the stream of your consciousness—
flowing endlessly.

In this observation,
you see that the self is nothing
but a movement of thought and memory.

And the moment you see the truth of this,
the self loses its authority.

Inward Observation Brings a Natural Silence

As the mind watches itself
without interference,

thought slows down naturally—
not through discipline,
not through control,
but through understanding.

Silence emerges
not as an achievement
but as a by-product of clarity.

This silence is not dullness.
It is an extraordinary sensitivity.

A mind that is silent
is a mind that sees.

Inward Observation Awakens Compassion

When you look inwardly
and see your own fear,
your own sorrow,
your own confusion—
not as abstract ideas

but as living facts—

you suddenly understand
the suffering of every human being.

Then compassion is born.

Not from effort,
not from duty,
not from moral obligation.

Compassion arises
when the observer dissolves
and only the movement of life remains.

Inward Observation Is Freedom

The moment you see a fact inwardly,
there is no conflict.

Seeing envy
ends envy.
Seeing fear
loosens its grip.
Seeing attachment
reveals its danger.
Seeing illusion
dispels illusion.

Inward observation
is action.

It is the flame
that burns away confusion
without the smoke of effort.

A mind that observes inwardly
is a mind that is free.

Free from the known,
free from conditioning,
free from itself.

***

A Dialogue

“Sir, what does it mean to observe inwardly?”

Questioner:
Sir, we often hear you say,
‘Observe yourself,’
‘Be aware of your thoughts,’
‘Look inwardly.’
But what does it truly mean to observe inwardly?
How are we to begin?

Teacher:
Sir, let us first understand
what we mean by observation.

We observe the world outwardly—
the mountains, the rivers,
the movement of clouds,
the noise of traffic.

But inward observation
is something entirely different.

It requires a quality of mind
that is not seeking results,
not driven by fear or desire,
not condemning or justifying.

To observe inwardly

is to watch the whole movement
of your consciousness—
your thoughts,
your emotions,
your motives,
your reactions—
without the observer interfering.

This observation
is the beginning of intelligence.

“But sir, when I observe, I judge myself.”

Questioner:
Whenever I look inwardly,
I immediately judge myself.
I say, “This is good,”
“This is bad,”
“I must change,”
“I should not feel this.”

How can I observe without judging?

Teacher:
Madam, the very act of judging
prevents observation.

Judgment is the movement of the past.
The past says,
“You must be this,”
“You must not be that.”

So, when you judge,
you are not observing—
you are comparing what is

with what should be.

The “should be”
is an ideal created by thought.

Where ideals operate,
observation ends.

To observe inwardly
you must set aside
all ideals, all conclusions.

Can you look at yourself
without the word,
without condemnation,
without resistance?

If you can,
you will see yourself clearly
for the first time.

And the very seeing
brings transformation.

“Is inward observation analysis?”

Questioner:
Sir, is observing oneself
a form of analysis?
Should we analyse our thoughts and feelings
to understand them?

Teacher:
Analysis implies
a division between the analyser

and the analysed.

But the analyser is the analysed.

The one who says,
“I must analyse my anger,”
is himself a fragment of anger.

Analysis therefore strengthens division.
Division creates conflict.
Conflict cannot bring clarity.

Observation is not analysis.

Observation is without division.

It is the simple act
of watching the movement of thought
as it arises,
without choosing,
without interpreting,
without trying to change anything.

In that watching,
thought reveals its own structure.

And what is revealed
is understood instantly.

“But thought moves so fast. How can I observe it?”

Questioner:
Sir, my thoughts move quickly—
from one thing to another.
Before I can observe one thought,

another appears.
How am I to observe inwardly
when thought is so rapid?

Teacher:
Sir, you do not have to observe
every thought.

You need only observe
the movement of thought.

In the same way you watch a river—
not each drop of water,
but the flow.

Thought is a stream
that never stops.
It moves from memory
to reaction,
to desire,
to fear,
to comparison.

Watch its movement.

Not the content—
but the movement.

If you watch without choice,
the movement slows down naturally.

And in that slowing,
there is insight.

Thought becomes quiet

when it is observed without resistance.

“What do we actually observe when we look inward?”

Questioner:
When I look inward,
what is it that I actually see?
What am I observing?

Teacher:
You observe the whole content
of your consciousness:

- your fears,
- your desires,
- your hurts,
- your beliefs,
- your images about yourself and others,
- your loneliness,
- your ambitions,
- your pleasures.

It is like watching a mirror
that reflects not your face
but the movement of your mind.

To see this movement
without choosing is freedom.

Because when you observe inwardly,
you discover that the self—
the “me”—
is nothing but this movement
of memory and thought.

And when you see this clearly,

the self loses its rigidity.

“Isn’t inward observation difficult?”

Questioner:
Sir, this seems very difficult.
The mind is restless.
It wanders continuously.
How can we sustain inward observation?

Teacher:
Do not make inward observation
into a task,
a discipline,
a method.

When you make it difficult,
you have already created resistance.

Just watch—
casually, gently,
without pressure.

Like watching the sky
or listening to a distant sound.

If you force observation,
it ceases to be observation.

The mind becomes still
when it is deeply interested
in seeing.

Interest brings attention.
Attention brings silence.

Where there is silence,
observation becomes natural.

“Observation reveals the self, doesn’t it?”

Questioner:
Sir, through this observation
one begins to see the self
with all its contradictions.
Is awareness of the self
the purpose of inward observation?

Teacher:
The purpose is not self-improvement
or self-control.

The purpose is to see
the self as it actually is.

When you observe inwardly,
you see:

- the self seeks security,
- the self compares,
- the self competes,
- the self feels inadequate,
- the self clings to pleasure,
- the self resists pain.

In seeing the self,
there is a dissolution
of its illusions.

The self is not a permanent entity.
It is a bundle of reactions.

When these reactions are seen clearly,
their grip ends.

This ending
is freedom.

“Does inward observation lead to silence?”

Questioner:
Sir, when I observe inwardly for some time,
I feel a kind of silence emerging.
Is this real?

Teacher:
When you observe without distortion,
without effort,
without escape,
the mind becomes quiet.

Silence arises
not through control
but through understanding.

It is the silence of clarity,
not the silence of suppression.

In that silence
there is tremendous sensitivity.
A sense of vast space within.

This silence
is the ground of intelligence.

“Does inward observation bring compassion?”

Questioner:
As I observe myself,
I see fear, sorrow, conflict—
the same things I see in others.
Does this understanding
give rise to compassion?

Teacher:

Yes, indeed.

When you observe inwardly
with honesty and tenderness,
you discover that your suffering
is not different from the suffering
of every human being.

The pain you feel
is the pain of humanity.

When this is not merely an idea
but an actuality,
compassion is born.

Compassion is the perfume
of inward observation.

It arises naturally
when the self is quiet.

The Hall Falls Silent

Teacher spoke:

Sir, inward observation
is the beginning of wisdom.

It is not a path,
not a practice,
not a technique.

It is simply to watch
without the watcher.

To see every movement
of your own consciousness
without resistance.

In that very seeing
is the ending of confusion.

A mind that observes inwardly
is a mind that is free—
free from the known,
free from fear,
free from the burden of itself.

Such a mind
is truly alive.

The silence deepened—
a silence filled with clarity,
with stillness,
with a gentle sense of awakening.

*****

Order and Compassion

The Meeting of the Brain and the Universe

Physicist:
Sir, for years I have studied the structure of the universe—its galaxies, its symmetry, its astonishing self-organization. Everywhere in nature we find order without a controller.
But you speak of compassion as the expression of intelligence.
So may I ask, very simply:
Does cosmic awareness have compassion?
Is the universe itself compassionate?

Teacher:
Sir, before we answer that, let us be careful not to project the human mind onto the cosmos.
When we speak of compassion, we are often referring to emotion, to tenderness, to sentiment.
But the universe has no sentiment.
It does not operate through pleasure or pain, through fear or reward.
So, if we attribute compassion to it in that sense, we are moving away from fact into imagination.

Physicist:
So cosmic awareness is not emotional?

Teacher:
Emotion belongs to the human nervous system—
to memory, to experience, to the condition of the body.
The cosmos is not burdened with any of that.

Awareness Without a Centre

Teacher:
But please listen carefully.
Compassion, as I use that word, is not emotion.
Compassion is the action of a mind with no centre, no “me.”
It is awareness without distortion.

Physicist:
Without an observer?

Teacher:
Yes, sir.
When there is no observer separate from the observed,
when there is no division,
the mind has an extraordinary clarity.
From that clarity comes an intelligence that cares—not about my suffering or your suffering,
but about suffering itself.

That care, that intelligence, is what I call compassion.

The Universe as Order Without a Self

Physicist:
In physics we see similar principles.
A galaxy does not have a centre governing its movement.
Its order emerges from the interaction of millions of stars.
There is harmony without a controller.

Teacher:
Exactly.
There is order because there is no psychological self.
A star does not envy another star.
A galaxy does not seek power.
The universe is free of the burden we call “the me.”

Therefore, it moves without conflict.

Physicist:
But can we call that compassion?

Teacher:
Not in the sentimental sense.
But compassion is the highest form of order,
and in the cosmos, you find order of an extraordinary nature.
So, the ground of compassion and the ground of cosmic order may be the same.

The Brain as a Microcosm of the Universe

Physicist:
Neuroscience is beginning to show that the human brain, when free of inner conflict, enters a state of deep coherence. Different neural networks begin to synchronize.
It resembles the ordered state of a complex physical system.

Teacher:
Yes, sir.
When the brain is not chattering, not frightened, not comparing,
it becomes astonishingly still and sensitive.
In that stillness there is no centre.
When the centre is absent, the brain is in harmony with itself, and with the world.
That harmony is compassion.

Physicist:
So, compassion is a state of the brain?

Teacher:
No—please be careful.

It is not produced by the brain.
It is not an effect.
It is the natural outcome when the brain is free from the distortion of the self.
Just as the cosmos expresses order when there is no central controller,
the human being expresses compassion when there is no psychological centre.

The Ending of the Self

Physicist:
What exactly distorts the brain?

Teacher:
Thought creates a centre—
a movement of memory that says, “This is me.”
From that centre arise fear, comparison, ambition, loneliness.
This centre breaks the mind into fragments.
A fragmented mind cannot have compassion.

Physicist:
So, if the “self” ends, compassion naturally emerges?

Teacher:
Yes.
Not because you cultivate it,
but because the obstacle is gone.
When a cloud moves away, the sun shines.
The sun does not have to be created.

Physicist:
But if compassion arises only in the human brain when the self ends,
and the cosmos has no self,

does that mean the universe is compassionate?

Teacher:
The cosmos has no self,
but it also has no human brain through which to express compassion.
So, the universe is not compassionate—
it is ordered.

Compassion is the flowering of that same order in the human mind
when the self is absent.

The Same Ground

Physicist:
Then the cosmos and the human mind share the same fundamental ground of order?

Teacher:
They do, sir.
When the human mind is free of its conditioning,
it has the same quality of vastness,
the same silence,
the same harmony.

In that state the mind is not separate from the universe.
It does not stand apart and judge.
It moves with the whole.

And this movement is compassion.

The Scientist Reflects

Physicist:

This is fascinating.
In physics we often wonder about the connection between consciousness and the cosmos.
Are you saying they meet when the self ends?

Teacher:
Yes, sir.
Where the self ends, the infinite begins.
Not as a theory, not as a belief,
but as a fact to be lived.

The Closing Insight

Physicist:
So, the cosmos does not "have" compassion.
But compassion in the human being is the expression of the same order that governs the cosmos.

Teacher:
Beautifully said, sir.
Compassion is not personal.
It is not mine or yours.
It is the natural perfume of a mind that is whole.
A mind without the self is as boundless as the night sky.

In that boundlessness,
there is order,
there is intelligence,
and there is compassion.

Not two things—
but one movement.

***

Physicist:

Sir, I have watched galaxies turn
with the precision of a heartbeat.
I have seen particles dance
to laws older than light.
Everywhere in the universe,
there is order without a ruler,
movement without a commander.
And you speak of compassion
as an expression of intelligence.
Tell me—
does the cosmos itself have compassion?

Teacher:
How can the stars feel sorrow, sir?
How can space—boundless, cold, ancient—
know emotion?
The universe does not weep;
it does not console;
it does not cradle suffering.
So, if you give it compassion
in the human sense,
you are painting the heavens
with the colours of memory.

compassion is not emotion.
It is the perfume of a mind
with no centre.

Physicist:
In physics, too, we see it:
no central conductor,
no cosmic puppeteer—
just harmony unfolding
from a million interactions.

Teacher:
Yes.
A star does not compare itself
to the next star.
A galaxy does not claim privilege.
Space does not tremble with desire.

There is no “me” in the cosmos.
And because there is no “me,”
there is no conflict.

Physicist:
But the human brain—
so intricate, so ancient—
is filled with memory, fear, images.
It is a field of storms.

Teacher:
It is, sir.
Thought builds a little hut
in the vast wilderness of the brain
and calls it “home.”
That hut becomes the centre—
the “me.”
From that centre rise
fear, loneliness, ambition, sorrow.

This centre distorts awareness
as a cracked lens distorts light.

But when the centre dissolves
through insight—
not through effort—
the brain becomes as clear as still water,
reflecting everything

without ripples of fear.

Physicist:
When the self is quiet,
neural networks synchronize.
The brain becomes whole—
like a murmuration of birds
turning as one body.
It resembles
the order of the cosmos.

Teacher:
Yes, sir.
Where there is unity,
there is no resistance.
Where there is no resistance,
there is intelligence.
Where there is intelligence,
there is compassion.

Physicist:
Then does this mean
the universe is compassionate?

Teacher:
Not in feeling, sir—
but in essence.
The universe is order without a centre.
Compassion is order without a centre.
They are not two.
But the cosmos cannot act through feeling;
only man can.

So, compassion is the flowering
of cosmic order

in a human mind
that is free.

Physicist:
So, the infinite outside
and the infinite within
touch the same ground
when the self ends?

Teacher:
They do, sir.
When the “me” disappears,
the mind becomes vast—
not because it expands,
but because the walls fall away.

In that vastness
the brain moves
in the rhythm of stars,
in the silence of galaxies,
in the harmony of the whole.

Then compassion is not personal.
It is not “my compassion.”
It is the breath of the universe
moving through a quiet mind.

Physicist:
So, the universe does not love—
but love is the universe
when there is no self
to stand in its way.

Teacher:
Yes, sir.

The star, the leaf,
the river,
and the mind free of itself—
they are in the same movement.
The movement of wholeness.
The movement of compassion.

***

The universe functions through order.

Across the cosmos there is coherence without a controller, structure without a self:

- Galaxies rotate with mathematical precision.
- Atoms maintain stable configurations.
- Biological systems self-organize into astonishing complexity.

Physics, chemistry, and biology show that this order arises without desire, fear, ambition, or memory.
There is no psychological centre guiding a star or a molecule.
The universe moves in harmony because there is no "me" at the heart of it.

Now let us look at the human organism—particularly the brain.

Neuroscience reveals that the human brain is also an extraordinarily ordered structure, capable of immense intelligence.
Under conditions of insight or deep attention, different neural networks synchronize;
there is coherence, integration, and heightened sensitivity.

But when the psychological "self"—constructed from memory, conditioning, and past experience—interferes, this natural coherence is disturbed.

The Self as a Disturbance in an Otherwise Ordered System

Scientific studies show that:

- The Default Mode Network, associated with self-referential thought, becomes hyperactive when one is absorbed in fear, guilt, comparison, or desire.
- This hyperactivity interrupts integrated brain function, fragmenting perception and creating conflict.
- When the "self" quiets down—during insight, meditation, or direct perception—this network deactivates, and the brain shifts into a highly coherent, unified state.

So, the structure of the brain is capable of an order very similar to the cosmic order—
an intelligence that operates without a centre, without contradiction.

But the human brain, unlike the cosmos, carries the burden of psychological time—
the accumulation of memories, experiences, conclusions.

This accumulation becomes the "me."

And it is this "me" that fragments awareness.

Where the Two Awarenesses Converge

Cosmic awareness is not personal;
it does not arise from a centre.

It is the natural expression of an ordered universe.

Human awareness, when filtered through the self, becomes conditioned, fragmented, partial.

But the moment the "self-structure" is quiet—
quiet not through control, but through understanding—
human awareness exhibits the same qualities observed in nature:

1. Non-fragmentation

Neural activity becomes globally synchronized, similar to how physical systems self-organize.

2. Absence of psychological time

Thought slows, emotional reactivity diminishes, and perception becomes immediate.

3. Emergence of inherent intelligence

Insight appears spontaneously—just as order emerges spontaneously in complex systems.

4. Natural compassion

Compassion is not an emotion but the functioning of a nervous system free of defensive psychological patterns.

This is not mysticism; it is a fact observable both inwardly and scientifically.

When the psychological self is absent,

the awareness in man is not different from the order expressed throughout the cosmos.

Both share the same hallmark:
coherence without a controller, intelligence without a centre, order without effort.

The Scientific and the Sacred Meet in Silence

Science can measure the deactivation of the self-based networks.
It can describe integrated brain states.
It can show that insight occurs when the brain functions as a whole.

But science cannot measure the quality of awareness that appears when the self ends.

That quality is timeless, unbounded, immeasurable—
not supernatural, but simply free of fragmentation.

This is why Krishnamurti said:

“When the self is not, the other is.”

The “other” is not a mystical entity—
it is the same order that governs a galaxy,
the same intelligence that shapes a cell,
the same silence in which the universe unfolds.

When the human brain is no longer distorting awareness through the lens of the self,
it resonates with that universal order.

Then the observer is not separate from what is observed.

The brain is not separate from the cosmos.
Awareness is one—
not yours, not mine, not human, not cosmic—
simply one movement of intelligence without division.

*****

About the Author

Dr. Venkata Rao Potluru, M.S.
Surgeon • Philosopher • Reflective Writer

Born in 1947, Dr. Potluru is a Consultant General and Abdominal Surgeon with nearly five decades of experience, including fifteen formative years in war-torn Kurdistan, Iran, and five years in Misrata, Libya. He later continued his service as a Senior Consultant Surgeon in Visakhapatnam until his retirement in 2022.

Deeply influenced by the teachings of Jiddu Krishnamurti, his writings explore awareness, perception, compassion, and the ending of psychological conflict.

Books by Dr. Venkata Rao Potluru

- The Timeless Awareness
- Echoes of Awareness — Series 1, 2, 3 & 4
- Living Under Fire
- Where the Self Ends, Life Begins
- Operating Under Fire
- The Ground That Breathes Through All
- Cross Roads of Awareness
- Spark to Wholeness
- Life's Companion
- Guiding Lights
- Thought
- Awareness
- Life Lives Itself

Explore More

Free Reading:
All books are available on Internet Archive for free reading and download.
Search: Dr. Venkata Rao Potluru

Daily Reflections:
Tumblr — drvenkataraopotluru

Amazon Author Page:
All books available in eBook and paperback.
Search: Dr. Venkata Rao Potluru

*****

We live in illusions of our own making.

Thought shapes our fears, our pleasures, our beliefs, our images of ourselves—
and we mistake these shadows for I(ife.

This book is an invitation to see without distortion, to observe the movement of the mind without escape, judgement, or the weight of yesterday.
In such seeing, illusions dissolve on their own.

When thought becomes quiet,
when the observer ends,
a different kind of clarity emerges—
simple, direct, transformative.

This is not a path, not a method, not a belief.
It is the art of inward observation—
the art of seeing illusions as illusions,
and discovering freedom in that very seeing.